

ILLINOIS

Harry T. Peeck, Ashley.
 Edwin E. Jones, Bloomington.
 George L. Thrasher, Gilman.
 Harry E. Flesher, Lexington.
 Anna M. Tennyson, Manhattan.
 Lewis R. Inman, Oswego.
 Anton J. Berta, South Wilmington.
 Joseph C. Braun, Winnetka.

INDIANA

Arthur J. McLaughlin, Cedar Lake.
 Burr E. York, Converse.
 William H. Hailway, Hope.
 Henry D. Long, New Harmony.
 Clarence O. Rowland, Portland.

KANSAS

Ruth Herthel, Claflin.
 Newell R. Kirkham, Lebo.
 Marvin S. Gilbert, Lyndon.
 John Malone, National Military Home.
 Franklin S. Adams, Waterville.

LOUISIANA

Silvio Broussard, New Iberia.

MAINE

Alma R. Weed, Monticello.

MASSACHUSETTS

Alice D. Robbins, Littleton.

MICHIGAN

Joseph D. Watson, Homer.

MISSOURI

Willis M. Wallingford, Carthage.

NEW MEXICO

John A. Dickson, Fort Bayard.
 Henry L. Kelly, Mogollon.
 Tomas P. Martinez, Ranches of Taos.
 Canuto C. Sanchez, Santa Rosa.

NEW YORK

Charles G. Post, Bangall.
 William McNeal, Montgomery.
 Ida L. Baxter, Port Washington.
 Frank M. Douglass, Red Creek.
 Frank R. Hanson, Sea Cliff.
 Calvin H. Peters, Stamford.
 William T. Williamson, Troy.

NORTH DAKOTA

Paul Keller, Hebron.

OHIO

Harley F. Hambel, Glouster.
 John W. Hencke, Willoughby.

OKLAHOMA

S. Edgar Thomas, Dewey.
 June M. Jarvis, Haileyville.

PENNSYLVANIA

George C. Noblit, Brockway.
 William E. Muttersbough, Driftwood.
 Charles W. Hart, Elizabeth.
 George B. Stevenson, Lock Haven.
 Ira A. Dinger, Mayport.
 Oscar R. Moser, Mont Alto.
 James I. Decker, New Freedom.
 Annie H. Washburn, Wyncote.

PORTO RICO

Rafael P. Robert, Fajardo.

WISCONSIN

Melvin B. Arnes, Barronett.
 Lulu M. Hubbell, Draper.
 Blanch Lyon, East Ellsworth.
 Ida Englesby, Eleva.
 James C. Fritzen, Neenah.
 Wesley C. Hymer, Potosi.
 Blanche Delany, Sinsinawa.
 Susau D. Olson, Siren.
 Nathaniel C. Garland, Sturgeon Bay.
 Alphonse R. Eichman, Trempealeau.
 Fred J. Hurless, Viola.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, February 24, 1927

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

This day, blessed Lord, may our standards be so definite, our aims so distinct, that there shall be no mistake as to our decisions. Rule our conduct by the laws of truth and righteousness that it may be consistent before Thee. Impress us that the prize of life waits for those who earnestly seek it. May we cultivate forbearance until our hearts yield a full measure of this great virtue. We thank Thee that Thou dost claim the right of free and immediate access to every believing, loving heart. O may we

"Speak to Him for He hears, and spirit with spirit can meet. Closer is He than breathing, nearer than hands and feet."

In the name of Jesus our Savior we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONDITIONS IN CHINA

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the China resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the resolution introduced by the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. PORTER] and reported out of the committee by a nonpartisan vote of 14 to 3, the 3 voting present and not nay on the final passage of the resolution. There has been no haste about the presentation of this matter, despite the urgency and seriousness of the situation as reflected by the articles that are found daily on the first pages of the leading newspapers of the country. I am speaking the exact truth when I say that in the hearings before the committee we were favored with the testimony of men of the highest standing, who because of their thorough knowledge of conditions in China were able to give informative and reliable information with respect to all the facts upon this urgent question.

In the hearings that have been held since my association with this great committee, I have heard no more intelligent witnesses than those that appeared to urge the immediate passage of this resolution.

The deplorable condition existing in this benighted country is the result of the many unfair and unequal treaties that have been imposed on China by the great powers of the world, including the United States, and for the reason that that country has been unable to resist the will of the other great nations that have continued to oppress her.

The great Chinese people, asleep for years, are at last aroused by the nationalist sentiment that has swept the country during the past few years against treaties that deny the right to impose their own tariff restrictions, which, if allowed, the Chinese would be able through its customs duties to accumulate revenues sufficient to maintain its Government. Under these arbitrary treaties China is denied the right to fix a customs rate according to her own selection above a percentage in any amount determined by the powers to which I have referred. The trouble under which she is now laboring had its inception in 1842 when China, under duress, consented to the importation of goods into her own country imposed by a stronger nation. Since that time, in one way or another, the powers of the world have wrought their will upon this unfortunate people. She has not the right even to police or jurisdictional powers within her own country.

Nationals within her borders who commit offenses upon Chinese are tried for these offenses not before Chinese tribunals but in courts of foreign jurisdiction. American offenders for petty crimes are tried before consulate courts, presided over by foreign consuls, and for major crimes before the courts of American or European jurisdiction. This is the essence of serfdom and has no parallel in American annals. It is not just. It should not be. Now, what has happened. For many years the young students of China have come to United States and gone to European universities for education. They have been inoculated with occidental ideals and progressive ideas. Thus they have studied and absorbed and have taken back to their native land the ideals of the western peoples embracing democracy, national independence, enlightened, and modern civilization. These students have instilled this democracy into the minds and the hearts of the Chinese people, to the

end that they now at last are insisting on equality among the nations of the earth.

China is fully capable of self-government. She will continue her opposition and the fight for liberty and relief from the present oppressive treaties until extraterritorial rights and unequal treaties have been abolished. Her attitude toward America is friendly, but she naturally puts us in the imperialistic class because we ally ourselves with the other oppressing powers in our dealings with her country and its people.

We have ample reason for the adoption of this resolution. Realizing the seriousness of the present situation in China, a number of the powers have already indicated to the Chinese that they intend to take up separate negotiations in respect to them. It is my impression that Belgium, Japan, and Great Britain, and perhaps France, have already indicated an intention of their willingness to abrogate, in part, at least, the burdensome terms of their existing treaties, and to enter into new relations with China.

The hearings before our committee give every evidence that the Chinese people no longer respect the present agreements, and have risen to repudiate them. At this time they are merely scraps of paper, and of no weight or influence.

In the adoption of this resolution the United States relinquishes none of the rights of her citizens or property. We would never agree to sacrifice any rights that we have or hold under the present treaties. All we intend by this resolution is that the Secretary of State make some pronouncement of a friendly nature, so that the Chinese people may know that in this hour of their trouble our country, which has always befriended the oppressed, is now ready to enter into negotiations with the proper authorities in China to the end that they may be able to work out their destiny in their own way.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following House bill with amendments:

H. R. 16886. An act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to make loans to veterans upon the security of adjusted-service certificates," and that the Senate insists upon its amendments to said bill, and requests a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. Smoot, Mr. Reed of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Simmons.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed Senate bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 718. An act authorizing an appropriation to be expended under the provisions of section 7 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," as amended.

LOANS ON ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 16886) to authorize the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to make loans to veterans upon the security of adjusted-service certificates, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us what those amendments are?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know that I can tell them all. Mr. SNELL. They did not put on the emergency retirement bill, did they?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why does not the gentleman from Iowa ask unanimous consent to concur in the Senate amendments and thus get the bill immediately to the White House, so that the President may sign it, and so it may become a law? The main amendment which the Senate put on is the one which continues the law in force which gives \$80 compensation to the disabled men in hospitals. That is a good amendment, and if the gentleman would merely ask unanimous consent to concur in the Senate amendments, that would settle the matter. If this bill goes to conference, it may die and not become law.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Iowa, as is often the case, does not agree with the gentleman from Texas, and so can not consent to make such a request.

Mr. BLANTON. The one I mentioned is the principal amendment, is it not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I could not say. It is one of the amendments, at least.

Mr. BLANTON. How long is the gentleman going to keep the matter in conference?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I could not say about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object, but what I suggest is what ought to be done. We ought to concur in the Senate amendments and thus insure the passage of the bill. And to say the least, we ought to instruct our conferees to agree to this Senate amendment.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation two weeks ago to-day reported out the bill which is embodied in the Senate amendment. Unfortunately, for some reason or other, that bill was reported to the House only yesterday. If we could accept the Senate amendment, it would help matters greatly. It is very unjust to these men who are in hospitals that they should be cut off from this \$40 on the 1st of July.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman will understand that this is just another instance of the Senate's practice of tacking on amendments which have nothing to do with the original bill, and putting them in at the wrong place. It is a practice that ought not to be adopted.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I realize that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And for myself I can not encourage that practice. If we consent to do it in one case, we will have to consent to it in others.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But if the gentleman does not agree to it, in all probability on the 1st of July these men will lose 50 per cent of their compensation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not familiar with that bill and have had no opportunity to familiarize myself with it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Would the gentleman withdraw his request for a few minutes and let me familiarize him with it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not do that. We must get along with this matter.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. What rate of interest does the Senate fix for the loans?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The same as the House bill. It is not changed.

Mr. EDWARDS. Then there is no disagreement on that?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is to send this bill to conference. Mr. RANKIN. The only material amendment made by the Senate, as I understand it, is to provide this change where these men are to be reduced from \$80 to \$40 on the 1st of July.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not know. I do not know what the other Senate amendments are.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is to strike out the existing law and put the disabled veterans without dependents on the status where they are now.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand; but they amended the bill so that these men may receive the full benefit of their compensation even after the 1st of July.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand they put on some such amendment, which does not properly belong on this bill at all.

Mr. RANKIN. And the gentleman's request is that this bill be sent to conference?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. To die there.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; it will not die there. It will be passed at this session.

Mr. RANKIN. I presume I violate no secret of the committee, and if I do I take the responsibility for it, because I think the time has come when the members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation have a right to be heard, when I tell the House that we voted unanimously for this change in the Veterans' Committee.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no one who is more ready than I that they should be heard.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa wants this bill to go to conference. As I understand the Senate amendment which is being discussed, it is an amendment that would be entirely within the jurisdiction of the

World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, while this bill under consideration now comes from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be more familiar with this legislation, perhaps, than the gentleman from Texas. Mr. GARNER of Texas. I agree with that.

Mr. RANKIN. For the simple reason that, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] will remember, we have discussed it in the committee and we passed a resolution through our committee to report this provision to the House two weeks ago.

It has the approval of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. It has the approval of the United States Senate, and I am not willing to take the risk of its going to conference and being killed there and these boys knocked out of the benefit of the money that is appropriated for them by the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. The preferential motion is to move to concur in the Senate amendment. Why is not that made?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In which event it goes to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLANTON. Then let it go there, and we can go into the Committee of the Whole House immediately and approve it. We may just as well thrash it out here now as at any other time, for we must complete this bill before we adjourn.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection for the moment. The gentleman from Tennessee wants to make a statement.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, has consent been granted?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Tennessee desires to make a motion which is privileged at this time.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I move that we instruct the conferees to agree to the third Senate amendment, which is in regard to receiving \$80 a month for those in hospitals.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee makes a preferential motion to instruct the conferees to agree to Senate amendment No. 3.

Mr. BLANTON. Let us have it reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, after line 20, insert:

"Sec. 3. That the last paragraph of paragraph 7 of section 202 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, is hereby repealed."

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question, unless the gentleman from Iowa desires to address the House.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this instruction ought not to be given to the conferees for a number of reasons. In the first place the legislation which is sought to be engrafted on this bill is something that does not belong to the Ways and Means Committee and has no relation to the matter contained in the original bill, and we simply have another example of what the Senate does in putting on amendments that have no relation whatever to the bill that is before them, and they get them through in that kind of a way when they could not get them through their own body otherwise.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order. The gentleman is violating the rule by assailing a body at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. BLANTON. He is doing it as a whole, and that is permissible.

Mr. HOWARD. The point of order was raised upon me for divulging the secrets of a common House committee, and now the gentleman is assailing that august body.

Mr. BLANTON. That is, the body as a whole.

Mr. HOWARD. You can do that as a body—that is all right, let it go. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to say this legislation is not perfectly proper. Neither am I prepared, nor is the House prepared, properly to consider it at this time. It ought to be brought up in the regular way through the World War Veterans' Committee, which has authority and control over these matters, whereas the Ways and Means Committee has not. It is not informed about it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The Veterans' Committee two weeks ago voted this very proposition favorably, and yesterday reported a bill containing this very same proposition.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not yield for a speech. As far as that is concerned, it does not alter the situation. If that bill comes up the gentleman knows it would be considered under altogether different rules. It would be considered in Committee of the Whole, and this motion ought to be voted down.

Mr. BULWINKLE and Mr. RANKIN rose.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I always yield to my two friends here.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa all bills coming from the Veterans' Committee are held up until the last few days and then rushed through under suspension of the rules, with practically no time or opportunity for amendment whatever.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, I have no objection to its being considered in that way.

Mr. RANKIN. With no debate and no opportunity offered for amendment.

Mr. BULWINKLE. When the gentleman gets through will he yield me five minutes in which to make a statement?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will; but we can not here properly debate this matter now. This is a question of propriety of procedure. If we yield in this manner, we shall always be troubled with matters of this kind which are put on at the last minute in the hope that some delay might occur which will force us to yield.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me five minutes as the mover of the resolution?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; and at the end of that time I shall move the previous question. Now I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] five minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not like the way this legislation is brought before the House, and I would not be here asking for the House to give it consideration if it did not affect the very health and well-being and mental condition of hundreds of thousands of ex-service men who are in the hospitals of the United States.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. In a minute.

There is this situation presented: The Veterans' Committee of the House was never called together, although this bill was introduced in December. Two weeks ago we reported it at the first call, and the committee ordered it reported, and it was reported by the chairman only yesterday. If this does not go into effect, an amendment which was placed on the law in the Senate in 1924 by a Member of that body deprives the men who are in Veterans' Bureau hospitals, who are without dependents, of 50 per cent of their compensation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The reason why this law is in this condition is because the House at some previous time let a Senate amendment be put on just as this one was put on.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes; and when the Senate proposes to correct itself I am perfectly willing to give them an opportunity to do so. [Applause.] That is another reason why I ask you to let it pass without further objection. For the well-being of the disabled men affected by the law, I am appealing to the House to help them out.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. Does not this measure affect vitally the interests and the very lives of insane people who are now in the hospitals?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; it does not affect those who are mentally ill, but it does affect all other cases where there are no dependents of those who are ill in the hospitals.

Mr. RANKIN. If we concur in the Senate amendment, it will not cost the Government of the United States a dollar more, will it?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No. It will not cost anything, because this money is supposed to be held out in behalf of these sick men.

Mr. BLANTON. Unless we pass this, from July 1 to next December, when we meet again, these men will be wholly without compensation?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; they will receive not exceeding 50 per cent of their compensation.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean their compensation of \$80 a month.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes. Fifty per cent of their compensation, not exceeding \$40 per month.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. We are just restoring the present condition?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And we might just as well put it in this bill as in any other bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes. I trust the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] will not wreak his vengeance on another body in this way in this instance. If it were not for the situation of these men, I would not ask it, but to-day we know that this is possibly the only chance for remedying the mistake that was made in 1924.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have no doubt that the gentleman firmly believes that everything he states is absolutely correct.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I know it is absolutely correct.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. But I have no way of finding out.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am asking the gentleman to withdraw his opposition for a few minutes, and I can take him outside, with Members representing both sides of the Veterans' Committee, and he will be so informed that he will be absolutely content to let the Senate amendment pass without objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That would not give time enough to investigate this matter at all.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is the effect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman yields back his time, I wish to ask him a question. Is it not a fact that unless this is enacted in this way the veterans can not get legislation at this session?

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is. We can not get it otherwise.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me five minutes?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, practically all legislation respecting veterans' affairs, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] knows, since our committee was organized has been done under suspension of the rules. I think the gentleman will admit that the committee has done good work in preparing those bills. This amendment was reported out unanimously by our committee. It simply means that these boys in the hospital, unless this provision is passed, who have no relatives who are dependent upon them, will be reduced from \$80 to \$40 after next June 30.

That is a discrimination which should not be visited upon these men. The result will be to drive a number of them out of the hospital, because all they have to do is to step out of the hospital with their total disability and draw the full amount. They ought to be given all the treatment that the hospital can give them. This amendment was placed on in the Senate under circumstances similar to the present. We had to take it or leave the whole measure. I see no harm in correcting the error by the same method as that by which the error was committed. I hope the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] will not insist on his opposition to this motion to concur in the amendment.

Mr. SNELL. I am in accord with the gentleman from Tennessee about the measure itself, but I oppose its coming in in this way. I favor it coming up in the usual way. In that case there would be no opposition to it. I think that would be the better way than to attempt it here.

Mr. BROWNING. If we get legislation at this session it will have to come under suspension of the rule.

Mr. SNELL. That is probably true.

Mr. BROWNING. We have prepared a hospital bill with the hope of getting it through at this session, and also other measures. This will simply get out of the way one of the serious propositions, and I do not think it will do violence to the legislative situation to let this go through. It is really akin to the other proposition. We can not hope to get a rule for all the good provisions we have reported.

Mr. SNELL. There is a prospect that before the session ends the veterans' legislation can go through.

Mr. BROWNING. This same provision was placed in our bill after it went to the Senate. When it came back to us we had to take it without any consideration of this unjust provision.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the gentleman as far as the justice of the legislation is concerned, and I am going to support it, but I think it should come up in the regular and logical way.

Mr. BROWNING. The gentleman knows that on hundreds of occasions matters of this kind are passed in this way.

Mr. SNELL. But it is very seldom that we instruct our conferees on matters of this kind.

Mr. BROWNING. We want to relieve them of the embarrassment of insisting that the Senate should not have done it. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman is mistaken. There are other ways by which this can be done instead of by this method and by the method of suspending the rules. It will only take a few moments for the Rules Committee to bring in a rule to take care of all these matters. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] is the chairman of that committee. He is a powerful man on that committee, and he can provide this relief whenever he thinks it is necessary.

Mr. BROWNING. But the gentleman understands that in these last days of the session and in this legislative jam everybody can not get what they think is meritorious, and this is one way to be certain of it. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. As the measure stands now, it has the unanimous approval of the Veterans' Committee, has it not?

Mr. BROWNING. That is my understanding.

Mr. RANKIN. We do not know that what they would bring back from the conference would meet with the approval of the members of the Veterans' Committee, do we?

Mr. BROWNING. The gentleman is correct; and I hope the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] will not continue to oppose this motion.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If this bill is not passed, when does this restriction, involving a cut in the pay of these men, commence?

Mr. BROWNING. On June 30, 1927.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Then, as I understand it, there was a Senate amendment enacted into law which will not take effect until July 1 of this year?

Mr. BROWNING. That is true; but it will go into effect unless this correction is made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I said I did not feel I could permit any more debate, but I can not refuse to yield to the distinguished leader of the minority. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] three minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I really can not add anything new to what has been said by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and by my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. BROWNING] who makes this motion; but there has been some disorder in the Chamber and it will not be amiss, I think, to restate exactly what is involved, and that is that the Senate has adopted an amendment which corrects a provision which almost everybody admits was an error made in the last act we passed relative to the compensation of men who are in hospitals and who have no dependents after July 1, 1927. It is a very plain and simple matter. I do not think we need to stand upon the technicalities of the jurisdiction of the respective Houses. The question, after all, is the merit of the legislation itself. [Applause.] As a matter of fact, as has been stated, almost every act which this House has passed for the last five years in behalf of the veterans has been passed under suspension of the rules. The very bill in which this error was made was passed under suspension of the rules. It was not an error, however, made by the House committee; the error was put in by the Senate itself; then it was continued in the conference report; and when that conference report came back to the House we had to vote it up or down as a whole, and there was no chance to bring about any relief whatever. But here is a chance now upon a plain and simple matter. It is no discourtesy to the conferees. It is merely the expression of the House itself as to its attitude toward this legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to instruct the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to lay on the table the motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If that motion should prevail, will it not carry the entire measure to the table?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The Chair thinks it would only affect the motion in question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GREEN of Iowa) there were—ayes 33, noes 183.

So the motion to table was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the motion to instruct the conferees.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. GREEN of Iowa, HAWLEY, TREADWAY, GARNER of Texas, and COLLIER.

PROMOTION OF ARMY OFFICERS ON RETIRED LIST

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report for printing under the rule on the bill (H. R. 5028) for the promotion of certain officers of the United States Army now on the retired list.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of two bridge bills, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman regard this as a matter of emergency?

Mr. DENISON. I do, Mr. Speaker, and I have a telegram here which states the emergency. I may also say the bills are in the usual form.

The first bill is (H. R. 17128) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Indiana, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River, and permitting the State of Kentucky to act jointly with the State of Indiana in the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Indiana, acting by and through its State highway commission, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between a point in or near the city of Evansville, Ind., and a point opposite in Henderson County, State of Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the State of Indiana, acting by and through its State highway commission, its successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes and by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property in such State.

SEC. 3. The said State of Indiana, acting by and through its State highway commission, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 15 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient to pay the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches shall have been provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, repair, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for operating, repairing, and maintaining the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. At any time before or after the completion of such bridge the State of Kentucky may acquire any such interest in such bridge, including its approaches as a part thereof, as it may elect to acquire, but not exceeding a one-half interest therein, upon such terms as may be agreed upon between said States; and upon failure to so agree may acquire such interest by paying to the State of Indiana such sum as shall equal the actual cost of that proportion of such bridge so acquired by it. And if at any time said State of Kentucky shall acquire a full one-half interest in such bridge, then the right to take tolls for the use of such bridge shall immediately cease; and said right to take tolls shall also cease if and when the net tolls taken, after deducting the cost of collecting such tolls, shall amount to one-half the actual cost of such bridge plus interest thereon at the rate of 5 per cent per annum; and thereafter said bridge shall be free and no toll shall be charged for the use thereof.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I present another bill (H. R. 17264) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Mount Carmel, Ill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge authorized by act of Congress, approved March 3, 1925, to be built across the Wabash River from a point in the city of Mount Carmel, Wabash County, Ill., to a point in Gibson County, in the State of Indiana, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee making a survey of the government of the District of Columbia may have permission of the House to sit during sessions of the House.

Mr. RAMSEYER. What subcommittee is it?

Mr. GIBSON. The one making a survey of the government of the District.

Mr. RAMSEYER. There is a subcommittee of that special name?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 15641) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho calls up a conference report on the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15641) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 7, 8, 22, 23, and 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 15, 16, 18, 19, and 26, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$65,068,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,362,533"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$124,428,702"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$19,128,975"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,535,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$148,092,927"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,522,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$20,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$9,480,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 25 and 27.

BURTON L. FRENCH,
GUY U. HARDY,
JOHN TABER,
W. A. AYRES,
W. B. OLIVER,

Managers on the part of the House.

FREDERICK HALE,
LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER,
CLAUDE A. SWANSON,
CARTER GLASS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15641) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On Nos. 1 and 2: Provides for actual expenses of midshipmen while on shore patrol duty at home and abroad, as proposed by the Senate, instead of abroad only, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 3 and 4: Appropriates \$75,000 for permanent classified employees at the naval research laboratory, as proposed by the House, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 5 and 6, relating to the Naval Reserve: Appropriates \$3,890,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,850,000, as proposed by the House, and increases the limitation on expenditures from this appropriation on account of aviation material, equipment, and rental of hangars from \$329,888, as proposed by the House, to \$364,010, as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 7 and 8: Strikes out the restriction proposed by the Senate on broadcasting from naval radio stations.

On Nos. 9 to 15, inclusive, relating to pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel: Appropriates \$148,092,927, instead of \$147,231,000, as proposed by the House, and \$148,954,854, as proposed by the Senate, thus providing for 83,250 enlisted men, instead of 82,500, as proposed by the House, and \$4,000, as proposed by the Senate, and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision with respect to including time spent at the Military Academy or the Naval Academy in computing the length of service of officers.

On Nos. 16 to 21, inclusive, relating to aviation, Navy: Appropriates for new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment \$8,522,000 instead of \$8,412,000, as proposed by the House, and \$10,668,000, as proposed by the Senate; modifies the phrasing of the limitation on the cost of the rigid airship for which the bill makes provision, and authorizes contracts to be entered into for new aircraft and equipment to the extent of \$9,480,000, instead of \$5,000,000, as proposed by the House,

and \$10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, so that, as modified, provision is made for the construction and procurement of new aircraft and equipment to the extent of 245 planes, instead of 161 planes, as proposed by the House, and 323 planes, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 22: Strikes out the appropriation of \$250,000, proposed by the Senate, for new boathouse and training quarters for the crews at the Naval Academy.

On Nos. 23 and 24: Appropriates \$65,000 for assigned men, Marine Corps Reserve, as proposed by the House, instead of \$112,500, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 26: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision raising the limit of cost of one fleet submarine (mine-laying type).

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 25: Providing for the commencement of the construction of three light cruisers.

On No. 27: Relating to the payment of premiums to navy-yard employees and to the assignment of work to navy yards.

BURTON L. FRENCH,
GUY U. HARDY,
JOHN TABER,
W. A. AYRES,
W. B. OLIVER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Idaho yield to the gentleman for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield for that purpose, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to inquire, Mr. Speaker, the time that will be devoted to the consideration of this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho is entitled to recognition for one hour.

Mr. MILLER. And how will that time be divided?

The SPEAKER. It is in the gentleman's own control; but the conference report itself will be disposed of before any of the matters in disagreement are taken up.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRENCH. If the gentleman will permit, I think I can make a statement now that will satisfy everybody.

Mr. BUTLER. All right.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify and extend my remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as you have followed the conference report you have recognized that the conferees have come to an agreement on all but two of the items in dispute between the Senate and the House.

My plan is first to direct attention to the conference report itself which has to do with everything in the bill that was in difference aside from the two amendments upon which we did not agree. It will take considerable time to discuss one of those amendments, the cruiser amendment. After the conference report shall have been disposed of, it will then be my purpose to ask for considerable time for the consideration of this important subject. So then the cruiser amendment will not be involved in the discussion prior to the adoption of the conference report. The other amendment from the Senate, that is, what is known as the labor and contract amendment, touching navy yards and is the language that has been carried in one form or another for many years. Your conferees could not agree to that amendment under the rules. It is our purpose, however, to move to recede and concur in the amendment when it shall be reached.

With this general statement suppose we turn to the conference report.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Do I understand it is the purpose of the gentleman to move to concur in the cruiser amendment?

Mr. FRENCH. No; I was referring to the labor amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. There was so much confusion on the floor I could not understand the gentleman.

Mr. FRENCH. The bill as it passed the House carried \$314,752,680. The bill as it passed the Senate carried \$320,295,534. The Senate amendment in money increased the appropriation bill by \$5,542,854. And, in addition to that, the Senate raised the limit on contract authorization by \$5,000,000.

The Senate increases are divided as follows:

1. Naval Research Laboratory-----	\$25,000
2. Naval Reserve (giving training to 88 instead of 66 reserve officers)-----	40,500
3. Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel increase in average number of enlisted men from 82,500 to 84,000-----	1,723,854
4. Aviation—new aircraft and equipment (increase the number of new aircraft from 161 to 323, the extra cost being covered by this increase and the increase of \$5,000,000 in contract authorization)-----	2,256,000
5. Naval Academy, boathouse-----	250,000
6. Marine Corps, assigned men (increase from 2,600 to 4,500)-----	47,500
7. Increase of Navy, three cruisers-----	1,200,000
Total-----	5,542,854

The conference report disposes of all items affecting the amount of money carried by the bill save one—commencing the construction of cruisers, and affects the bill as passed by the House, as follows:

1. Naval reserve—reserve aviators, add-----	\$40,500
2. Pay, subsistence, etc., add for 750 additional men or for a total average strength of 83,250-----	861,927
3. Aviation, add for 4 new planes for reserve training-----	110,000
Total addition, direct appropriations-----	1,012,427
4. Add to contract authorization for 80 new planes, 245 planes in all-----	4,480,000

In its present shape, therefore, the bill carries in direct appropriations \$2,212,427 more than when passed by the House, which includes \$1,200,000 on account of cruisers, yet to be acted upon, and it exceeds the Budget estimates by \$2,261,457.

I think the Members of the House have in mind quite definitely most of the amendments that have been disposed of, and in the short time I feel should be taken at this point in debate I shall refer to but two or three.

First, in regard to personnel. When the bill passed the House it carried an appropriation for 82,500 enlisted personnel. We based that figure on the actual needs of the Naval Establishment, upon the assumption that two battleships the *Oklahoma* and the *Arizona*, would be out of commission, undergoing major overhauling, most of the year; upon the assumption that three battleships that are now undergoing major overhauling will not be in commission all of the fiscal year; upon the assumption that the two airplane carriers under construction will not have been in commission all of the next fiscal year; and upon further recognition that one or two of the older cruisers could be drawn from the service without affecting materially the efficiency thereof.

The Senate increased the personnel by 1,500 men, basing its general argument for the increase upon the condition of the Navy, and especially stressing the importance of increasing the personnel for shore stations. Your conferees could not accede to the Senate figure. We did not believe that this was the orderly or logical way in which to proceed. We thought that if the personnel figure of the Senate could be justified by an increase of 1,500 men it would be on the assumption that the two ships, the *Arizona* and *Oklahoma*, would not be placed in the yards for major overhaul. We offered to concur in the entire number of men proposed, 84,000, with the proviso that 1,500 men should not be drawn upon if these two ships were taken out of commission.

The Senate conferees refused to accede to that proposition. After every angle of the question had been considered, and with a knowledge that the session was approaching an end and that we must reach an agreement or final compromise on numbers of men and dollars, we added 750 enlisted personnel to the Naval Establishment, increasing the number to 83,250 thereby.

The next proposition that is of major consequence in the bill has to do with aviation. When the bill passed the House it carried for aviation 155 airplanes. The Senate amendment added 158 airplanes, or provided for a total of 313, exclusive of 4 added to the naval reserve. The theory upon which the House proceeded was twofold: First, that when the Congress a year ago provided for the five-year program it meant something when it said that the figures that were taken as the tentative suggestions for each of the five years were not to be regarded as conclusive, and that there was reserved to the Congress the right to appropriate as in its judgment it saw fit from year to year. We had in mind that attrition is going on at a certain rapid rate on account of obsolescence, and that before piling up a large number of airplanes that in another two or three years would be declared obsolete and obsolescent the better part of wisdom would be to provide the number necessary for an efficient aviation establishment for the Navy, and then, as we approach more nearly the perfection in the different types, expand the program of construction. We believe that that program will mean millions of dollars in savings to the Treas-

ury and not affect the efficiency of the aviation establishment to any extent whatever.

There was another factor: When the House conducted its hearings we were told by the Bureau of Aviation that the attrition was expected to be 23 per cent in 1928 instead of 33 per cent, as it had been running before the present year. We figured upon that basis. Those were the figures brought to us by the Budget and sustained by the reasonable hopes of the Bureau of Aviation. When the representatives of aviation went to the Senate committee they reversed their form on that proposition and told the Senate that they expected the attrition would reach nearer 33 per cent than 23 per cent, a remarkable change to make within a period of 60 days after the representation had been made to the House committee.

In dispute there were 158 airplanes. However, we felt we must reach an agreement. We assumed that possibly the later attrition figures of the bureau might be correct, and we acceded to increasing the number of airplanes by 80, making the number 235 instead of 155, as provided for in the House bill, and 78 less than provided by the Senate, exclusive of 4 other planes added to the naval reserve. We do not recognize the principle of the Senate, that we are required to provide a program that will mean 1,000 planes completely built and on hand at the end of any particular time and at the end of the five-year period. Again we struck out the direct appropriation for the additional 80 planes and provided contract authorization for them. We followed this latter plan for the reason that these airplanes will hardly be contracted for by the end of the fiscal year. They certainly will not have been completed, and therefore there was no need for putting money into the bill but merely contract authorization.

I think I may assume that the other factors that are involved in the general report are so well known to the Members of the House that I would not be justified in taking further time for their discussion prior to the consideration of the cruiser amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman does that will he yield me five minutes in which to discuss a matter that does not apply to the cruiser amendment?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes, I yield the gentleman five minutes and withdraw the motion.

Mr. PRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 22 in the bill, inserted by the Senate, provided for a new boathouse and training quarters for the crew at Annapolis. For 14 years I have been sitting on the Committee on Naval Affairs and have heard year after year requests from the Naval Academy Association for a new boathouse and training quarters. The boathouse is in shameful condition. It is likely to fall down. It has been condemned, and the suggestion was made to me last Saturday that if it were not for a fresh coat of paint occasionally, it would look like an old ruin. This year Commander Jonas Ingram, the director of athletics, came to Washington, and after explaining the very great necessity of a boathouse to some of his friends on this side of the Capitol, an amendment to the naval appropriation bill was inserted in the Senate, providing the fairest proposition the House has ever had before it. It was that if Congress would authorize \$250,000 appropriation for the construction of a new boathouse and new training quarters, the Navy Athletic Association, a private organization, would pay half of that expense. In other words, it would pay out of its Treasury \$125,000 in order to get the boathouse. That certainly was a public-spirited offer such as only an upstanding, red-blooded group of men would present, and for the life of me I can not understand why the Senate amendment was not agreed to and left in the bill. Of course, in its present parliamentary status I presume there is nothing which can be done. The Senate has receded and the amendment has been stricken from the bill. I am making this talk now to lay the ground plan for next year, when an attempt will be made for an appropriation through regular channels. There is not a university or college in the country that has so shameful a structure upon its premises as this boathouse. Everything else at Annapolis is beautiful in its refinement and architecture.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. And there is not a university in the country that has a crew like the Navy crew.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is true, but the suggestion coming from the academy itself that these boys will pay out of their private treasury \$125,000 as a contribution toward the building is certainly magnanimous and should have met with the approval of the conferees. I can not understand why it is not done, and I do not care to know, so far as that is concerned; but I am in hopes that next year the Committee on Appropriations will give consideration to this very worthy direction.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The Navy Athletic Association in Annapolis can easily afford to do that; and while I am with the gentleman in his position, I want to call his attention to the fact that they are not very generous with us Members in raising that \$125,000 for their private exchequer, because to get the four tickets that we usually get from the Naval Academy Association each one of us Congressmen pays \$14 a year.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; \$3.50 each for four tickets makes \$14 a year for each of us.

Mr. BRITTEN. Only if admission tickets are requested do they pay the \$14.

Mr. BLANTON. We all pay \$14 each if we get four tickets to use for ourselves and friends?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. We are all contributing, 435 Members and 96 Senators, about \$14 apiece annually to their private exchequer?

Mr. BRITTEN. Of course, I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not the gentleman pay \$14?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And I paid \$14 for mine. And if we get the tickets, we are required to do it every year.

Mr. KINDRED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. In that connection, does not the gentleman think there should be an investigation by the House of Representatives of the whole matter of the naval athletic transaction?

Mr. BRITTEN. No. I do not think so. I think they do everything they attempt wonderfully well; their books are audited regularly, and if there is one concern in the country in which I have absolute confidence it is the Naval Athletic Association at Annapolis.

Mr. KINDRED. Can the gentleman say the same thing in regard to the military branch, the conduct of foot ball in Chicago?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; without hesitation.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member from the House who served on the conference appreciates the necessity of a new boathouse at Annapolis. The House Members desired to concur in the Senate amendment, but there had been an oversight on the part of those having the matter in hand in failing to ask for a hearing and in failing to submit at such a hearing an estimate of cost, and when the gentleman asked for the reason it was left out. While I was not present at the time the particular matter was acted on, I am sure I have given you the reasons. Now, in response to the offer of the association to provide one-half of the expense of \$250,000, I doubt the wisdom of the House consenting to so large a contribution.

I think whatever they can contribute should be in cash, and I wish to suggest to my friend from Illinois, who is deeply interested in this matter, that it might not be amiss for the boys interested in contributing something to the building of the boathouse, to start during the year on the construction of a boathouse to cost approximately \$200,000. If they will subscribe reasonably towards that end, and when Congress meets in December next can show in course of construction a boathouse suitable to their needs Congress will no doubt meet them more than half way, and provide the necessary funds for the completion of their task.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman of course realizes that the authorities would not permit this private organization to start in on construction on Government property without having some legislation in advance?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The Secretary of the Navy might, since it is on Government property and needed, permit it to be done.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman will yield, while I have the very highest confidence and regard for the opinion of the gentleman, an expert on naval affairs, I merely want to say for one Member of the House I think we should provide these quarters without any consideration from the boys.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am largely in sympathy with the gentleman's view, to be perfectly frank, and certainly with regard to contributing one-half the amount.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois to make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FRENCH. I do.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the opinion of the Chair whether the Senate amendment is now out of the bill entirely and a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment would be in order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not the floor. The Chair did not recognize him for that purpose. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, the two matters that are now in dispute are Senate amendments Nos. 25 and 27. No. 25 is the cruiser amendment. No. 27 is the amendment relating to premiums, bonus, and so on, in the navy yard. In order that our attention will not be diverted at all, I ask unanimous consent to pass over amendment No. 25 and take up Senate amendment No. 27. I move that No. 27 be concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House concur in Senate amendment No. 27. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 53, line 17, after the word "work," insert the following: " ; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and that no part of the moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or herein made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 51, line 24, after the word "authorized," strike out the figures "\$13,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$14,950,000, of which sum \$1,200,000 shall be immediately available toward the construction of the last three of the eight scout cruisers authorized by section 2 of the act of December 18, 1924."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would have an hour of time, but I wonder if it would not be better to fix the time first and then proceed with the discussion. I can see from the time already requested of me that one hour would not be enough.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can first make his motion.

Mr. FRENCH. I move that the House disagree to the Senate amendment numbered 25 and ask for a conference.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read, known as the Tilson amendment, which was proposed here when we discussed this question about six weeks ago.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUTLER moves to concur in Senate amendment No. 25 with an amendment under the head "Increase of the Navy": Strike out the figures "\$13,750,000" and substitute therefor the following: "\$14,200,000, of which sum \$450,000 shall be immediately available toward the construction of the last three of the eight scout cruisers authorized by section 2 of the act of December 18, 1924."

The SPEAKER. The parliamentary situation is that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] in charge of the bill has the floor for at least an hour. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], however, offers a preferential amendment, which will be voted on before that of the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FRENCH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that the amendment does

not instruct the conferees. I raise a point of order if that is in order.

The SPEAKER. It is in order.

Mr. FRENCH. Then, Mr. Speaker, before beginning the discussion, it seems we ought to arrange about the time. There has been so much of a demand for time that I will ask unanimous consent that two hours' additional time be granted for the consideration of this question, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]—one-half of all the time.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will permit, under the circumstances the Chair would suggest that the time of the gentleman from Idaho be increased from one hour to three hours, with the understanding that he will yield half of his time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FRENCH. I accept that modification and will be glad to yield one-half of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the time be extended to three hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WINGO. Then there will be three hours' discussion, and the vote will first come on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment?

The SPEAKER. That is the parliamentary situation. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for three hours.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one hour and a half to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and suggest that the time be allotted by him, so that the gentleman can allot the time throughout the general debate—

Mr. BUTLER. In a friendly way.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for an hour and a half.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is obvious that there is no quorum present.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Ackerman	Freeman	Kurtz	Sears, Nebr.
Anthony	Garrett, Tex.	Lankford	Seger
Appleby	Gilbert	Lee, Ga.	Smithwick
Bailey	Goldner	McFadden	Sprout, Ill.
Bixler	Goldsbrough	Madden	Steagall
Boles	Gorman	Mead	Stobbs
Brand, Ohio	Hall, N. Dak.	Merritt	Strother
Brumm	Harrison	Michaelson	Sweet
Cleary	Hayden	Mills	Swoope
Connolly, Pa.	Hull, Tenn.	Morin	Taylor, Colo.
Crowther	Irwin	Newton, Mo.	Thurston
Davenport	Jenkins	Patterson	Tillman
Dempsey	Johnson, Ky.	Phillips	Tincher
Domnick	Kemp	Purnell	Tinkham
Doyle	Kendall	Rayburn	Walters
Fairchild	King	Reed, Ark.	Wilson, Miss.
Faust	Kirk	Reed, N. Y.	
Fredericks	Kunz	Reid, Ill.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEEDY). Three hundred and sixty-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, the Senate has added an amendment to the Navy bill carrying \$1,200,000 for commencement of construction of three cruisers authorized by the act of December 18, 1924. Your conferees have carried out what we believe to be the wishes of the House of Representatives and have steadfastly refused to concur in the Senate amendment. We believe that our position will be more secure as we go back into conference if you will again indicate your wish.

The Members of Congress do not want to do a foolish thing. The Members of Congress do not want to do an idle thing, which, so far as accomplishing the objective toward which it

seems to be aimed, is futile and at the same time may carry with it results that I believe the Members of Congress do not desire to attain. The members of your conference committee believe that it would be an unutterably foolish thing to agree to the Senate amendment; that it would be a futile thing to do from the standpoint of the accomplishment of anything worth while; and that to so agree would be to project an element into the program that the President is carrying forward that this Congress will not desire to add to the program if it can understand the situation.

In the brief time at my disposal I propose to outline the thought of your conferees on the subject.

WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

When the President sent the Budget estimates to the Congress in December he made the specific request that this Congress do not appropriate for the commencement of the three cruisers that have been authorized, but for which no appropriations have heretofore been made. The President based that request upon the international situation.

Nearly one year ago, upon the basis of an exchange of understandings, it was arranged that commissioners from the United States would meet in Geneva last year to confer with representatives of other nations to see if maybe another international conference could be arranged. Negotiations proceeded throughout the summer. A recess was had in September until the spring of 1927. At that time the conference will resume its deliberations. At that time your commissioners will be in attendance upon the conference. So, then, the conference is in recess.

In considering the question, let us be frank.

WHAT GOOD WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED?

Let us ask ourselves, What good can be accomplished by adding the Senate amendment or the substitute to the bill? First, we are told that the United States is deficient in cruiser strength in comparison with other nations that are parties to the 5-5-3 treaty agreement and that other nations are madly engaged in cruiser construction and the United States should follow suit.

My answer to this is twofold.

The ratio of the United States is not up to what it ought to be in comparison to the cruiser strength of Great Britain and Japan. But these nations are not engaged in mad construction programs. And, again, the difference in cruiser strength is not nearly the difference that proponents of the amendment are constantly asserting, and we are counseling delay for the purpose of bringing about an understanding by which less cruiser construction may need to be engaged in by the great powers.

More than that, if we are deficient in cruiser strength we are superior in certain other types of ships to an extent that, in part, offsets any deficiency in our strength in cruisers. This feature of the question I discussed at length when the bill was before the House for consideration.

Second, we are told that we should make the appropriation so that we may provide money for the preparation of plans and designs for building the cruisers for which larger appropriations shall be made.

My answer to that is that not one dollar of the amount involved in the amendment can be expended for this purpose under the law. If the Senators had this in mind as an objective, they do not show that it was their purpose, because they have added the money to an item that pertains to construction and not to an item in the House bill that pertains to the preparation of designs and plans. I can not conceive that the Comptroller General would honor the expenditure of so much as one dollar to augment the appropriations carried in the House bill for construction and design work.

My second answer to this proposition is that the plans for the three cruisers, for which contracts will likely be awarded within the next few months, are the plans that the department will follow essentially in the three cruisers for which no appropriations have as yet been made. So then from the standpoint of money being available for the preparation of plans and designs there is no use, upon the one hand, and the money can not be used for such a purpose upon the other.

Third. We are told that the money can be made available for the commencement of shipbuilding. My answer to that is that the three cruisers for which the money is sought to be appropriated will cost, including armaments, \$50,250,000. Surely no Member of Congress is so lacking in business judgment as not to know that an appropriation of scarcely more than 2 per cent on such a contract will be inadequate for the calling of bids and the actual letting of contract awards, and that such an appropriation would be inadequate, if the ships were to be built in a Government navy yard, for the assembling of material and the commencement of the work.

But we are told that the ships will be begun as early as next October, and that private concerns, in offering bids, will advance moneys and finance the project until Congress may appropriate at the next session.

Gentlemen of the House, we ought to be through with cost-plus contracts. [Applause.] Millions of dollars have been added to the cost of the airplane carriers on the basis of cost-plus contracts, and you are going to be called upon to add more millions in the present Congress before those ships can be completed. Do you want to repeat that type of foolishness here?

If another contract, which is not a cost-plus contract, is worked out and the contractor assumes the responsibility of putting up the money, bear in mind that he will add interest to his contract. It would not be recited in terms as interest, but it will be included there, and you will be paying millions of dollars additional over and above what these cruisers should cost before they will come from the yards where the contracts are awarded for their beginning.

The only other way, then, that contracts could be awarded would be with the distinct understanding that work would not be begun next October, but the contract would be awarded and the work would be begun the following spring—in other words, after the Congress shall have met next December and supplemented the amount appropriated here by \$15,000,000.

Fourth. We are told by the Senate conferees that in order to keep alive this authorization we must make an appropriation; otherwise the authorization would expire July 1, 1927. Gentlemen, \$1,200,000 is a lot of money to appropriate to keep the authorization alive. I recognize that that would be the effect, and knowing that, we proposed to the Senate conferees three lines which would extend the time of the authorization one year or as an alternative that will strike the time limit from the authorization. If gentlemen are in good faith and are seeking a way in which to extend the time of the authorization, let them accept one or the other of the alternate amendments your conferees proposed.

WHAT HARM WILL IT DO?

May I now come to the next question, "What harm will it do?"

First. The smallest factor in the answer to what harm it will do is that which pertains to orderly methods of appropriating money from the Federal Treasury. An appropriation of \$1,200,000 will not, in my judgment, be expended to the extent of \$1 until more than one year from now, and not then unless the Congress shall add ten or fifteen millions of dollars to the amount for construction purposes. It simply means that this Congress will be doing the unwise thing of appropriating \$1,200,000 and letting it continue to lie idle in the Treasury.

Second. The program will do incalculable harm, because it will lead the world to suppose that a break has occurred between the President of the United States and the Congress in the efforts of our country to bring about limitation of armaments.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Just briefly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. As I understand it, the President has never urged any objection to extending the period of the authorization.

Mr. FRENCH. Not that I know of.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Not now.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will not the gentleman yield at this point to correct a statement?

Mr. FRENCH. I can not yield now.

We are told that the President, two weeks ago, invited the nations that are signatory to the existing limitations of armaments treaty to join the United States in still further limitation programs. We are told that already a rebuff has been received from France and from Italy, and that because of this we should not hesitate to go ahead and make the appropriation. Gentlemen fail utterly, apparently, to grasp the incongruity of such procedure. It is true that the responses from France and Italy are not the fine responses looking to cooperation that we had a right to expect from these Governments. But bear this in mind, the response from Japan has been favorable. The attitude of the British press indicates that the reply from Great Britain will be favorable.

Mr. ANDREW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I can not yield now.

The three of the five nations to the present limitations of armaments treaty—the United States, Great Britain, and Japan—the three nations that are most able financially to engage in shipbuilding competition, have indicated, or will indicate, their approval of the program. The nations that have indicated an immediate adverse reaction are the nations that least of all can afford to engage in a race in armaments.

Mr. BRITTEN and Mr. ANDREW rose.

Mr. FRENCH. I can not yield now.

The proposition is still pending. Negotiations and exchanges of thought will occur during the next weeks and months. In other words, a period has not been placed at the end of the paragraph. We are still in the process of consideration, and I believe that when France and Italy, the two nations that least of all can afford financially to engage in a race for armament construction, come to realize that the three powers that with them are parties to the existing treaty are willing to extend the principle still further and to limit ship competition still more, and when they realize that these three powers are financially able to go forward in such degree as can not be matched by France and Italy, they will consider further the question of whether or not they have not more to gain by entering into an understanding that will limit the necessity for drains upon their treasuries and further tax burdens upon their people.

In my judgment there will be a repercussion in those two nations that will bring them in line with an agreement that will have for its purpose the limitation of armament, to which the nations most capable of competition are so willing to accede. [Applause.]

But, gentlemen, there is another element that must be considered. This whole question has been the subject of preliminary consideration by representatives of great nations during the past year at Geneva. Our commissioners were there, and commissioners from the United States will assemble again in Geneva within 30 days to take up still further the question of limitation in arms.

The President, in his message to the Congress, December last, specifically rested his appeal to the Congress not to make appropriations for new cruiser building upon the prospects of further limitations through international understandings. Last Friday, February 18, the House of Representatives appropriated \$75,000 to meet the expenses of the President's commission that will meet at Geneva and be in session during the coming months. There was not a record vote upon the question. Only one Member of the House, as I recall, denounced the expenditure as a foolish waste of money, and that was our distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. What was in the minds of the Members of this Congress last Friday, when, without a record vote, \$75,000 was appropriated for the use of the President in continuing the conference?

Gentlemen, do you realize what you are doing? You have called upon the President three times to take the leadership in efforts to bring about further limitations of armaments. The President is in the midst of his program. The President has called upon you not to embarrass him in his program. It was upon that thought that you refused to vote into the bill, when it was pending in the House, money for three cruisers. Every reason that existed then exists now why you should not accede to the Senate amendment.

I can not understand how men will one day vote \$75,000 for the President to use in the preliminary conference and within a week turn around and embarrass the President by doing that which he has said he believes ought not to be done.

You can not justify your consciences by saying "We have voted three times that the President shall take leadership and we have given him money with which to carry on the conferences," if at the same time you do that which will most of all embarrass him in his work by letting the world understand that there is a conflict of opinion between the Chief Executive of the United States and the Congress.

In an international matter of this character it is the duty of our country to present a united front. I have already told you that you will not advance the actual commencement of building the cruisers one day by the action that you are proposing here and that the Senate has proposed. But, on the other hand, if you will not advance the actual work of construction one day, you will do that which will embarrass the President in carrying forward the work you have placed upon him.

Gentlemen, I can understand why it is that gentlemen who are opposed to another conference will favor the Senate amendment. I can understand how my friend from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] can vote for the Senate amendment.

I can understand how Members of Congress who believe that war is a means of inspiring and sustaining the virility of nations, that it makes for higher and better civilization, will stand opposed to the President and will favor the Senate amendments.

I can understand how all forces will support the Senate amendments who believe in competitive shipbuilding among world powers, because the passage of the Senate amendments will be an element that will provoke suspicion upon the part of other nations toward our Government.

But, gentlemen, I can not understand how Members of this House who believe in limitation of armaments through international agreements will be guilty of sabotage or how they can support the Senate amendment for the beginning of three cruisers.

There is only one other thought I am going to express this afternoon. I know the pressure that is being brought upon Members of this House. Members of your subcommittee are receiving the intimation of that pressure from every corner of our country, from navy yards under the Government, from establishments that will be benefited by ship construction all over the United States, from press, from magazines published in places where there are large Navy pay rolls, all of them unconsciously, undoubtedly, influenced by an inordinate exaggeration of the importance of their locality and not having in mind the perspective they ought to hold toward this great country. [Applause.]

This pressure is being brought to bear upon the Congress. It is being brought to bear upon your committee and your conferees. The Republicans on that committee—Mr. HARDY, Mr. TABER, and myself—not only can meet the issue on its merits but we are following the lead of the President of the United States whom we have elected. But, gentlemen of the House, there are two other Members on the committee who are not of the Republican faith. The Representative from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], two gentlemen who as they have studied this question have placed the welfare of the Republic above partisanship [applause], men who have said that while it would be to political advantage to embarrass the President, they do not propose to do it. [Applause.] Gentlemen, in an hour like this, that marks the crisis in a program looking to world peace and looking to the lifting of the burden of war, all honor and credit should be given to these men who have manifested courage of such order as matches the traditions of this body and who have dared to stand against what would mean temporary advantage to their party by embarrassing the President of the United States.

So, then, I appeal to the Members of this body of all parties. If you believe in further limitation of armaments, if you support the program that you have charged the President of the United States with carrying out, the program that justified you a week ago in voting an authorization for \$75,000 to carry forward, vote down the Senate amendment and the substitute, or either of them, and give your whole strength to the task of carrying forward the great program looking to the easing of the burdens that through increased armaments are placed upon the shoulders of the citizens of your country and of the people of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that by unanimous consent I have the privilege of allotting one hour and a half of the time to be consumed in general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I yield one-half of that time—45 minutes—to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Have I the right to parcel out that 45 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has that right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield 10 minutes to myself.

Mr. Speaker, the primary duty of government is self-preservation and no argument can at any time justify it in stripping itself of its means of defense and relying for its preservation upon the mercy, the pity, or the love of other nations.

No government which fails to provide for its own preservation against the assaults of every possible foe is entitled to the support of its people.

In determining what naval construction this Government should undertake at this time, or at any other time, it ought to be bound by the needs of the Nation, having regard for our position among the states of the world, the location of our possessions, the extent and routes of our trade, and the policy we may adopt in our international relationship.

At the very outset of my remarks in support of the Senate amendment, I deem it highly important to call to your attention the mission of the Navy. The primary duty devolving upon it is to protect continental United States—the homeland—from conquest and invasion. In addition to this important mission, it must defend our far-flung insular possessions; maintain for our commerce the freedom of the seas; defend the greatest engineering enterprise and commerce carrier of the century—the Panama Canal; maintain our open-door policy in the Orient; enforce our policy of noninterference by monarchial governments in Central and South Ameri-

can Republics; defend our national honor and protect and redress American citizens wherever wronged.

We are the richest Nation on earth; we are the greatest export Nation on the globe. The product of the farms of the South—our cotton, and the products of the farms of the West—the wheat, corn, cattle, and pork, as well as the manufactured articles of the North and East, traverse routes of trade to the four quarters of the earth.

Our trade routes, in case of a national emergency, must be protected so there will be no stagnation at our ports, and it devolves upon the Navy to guarantee our commerce and routes of trade.

Our coast line not only embraces that of continental United States, but under our Monroe doctrine, also embraces the coast line of every country of Central and South America. This mission alone requires a navy of strength and with many types of ships.

As long as we are dependent upon the Chilean nitrate fields, and as everyone knows explosives of every kind require nitrates, we must make this route of trade as impregnable against every assault as the ingenuity of man can provide. But, sir, it is to be hoped that the day is near at hand when this Government will no longer jeopardize its national defense by being required to obtain its nitrate from a foreign country.

Our lines of commerce and communication with our insular possessions, thousands upon thousands of miles away from the home land, must be uninterrupted, and our Navy is the only means of accomplishing this.

Such a mission as I have briefly outlined requires that this Government at all times maintain our Navy in the highest state of efficiency, both in material and personnel, and that it be a balanced fleet to be able at any moment to meet any emergency that might confront the Government.

We are a world power, and our position in the world requires that our Navy be in many oceans. The policy of this Government requires that we maintain a fleet in the far-distant Asiatic waters, and to-day there is based in these waters 59 vessels of the Navy; in the Mediterranean, 8 vessels; in the Caribbean Sea, 18 vessels; in the Atlantic, 95 vessels; in the Pacific, at Hawaii, 25; and also in the Pacific, along our coast, 116 vessels.

If there is one policy that is firmly fixed in the minds of the American people, it is that they are opposed in times of peace to a large standing army; but, sir, on the other hand, the people of this country, knowing that the Navy is the first line of our national defense, have stood for in the past, and will continue to champion in the future, a program, of whatever character it may be, that will assure to this Government a navy of sufficient strength, so balanced and proportioned that it will be in readiness at any and all times to meet any and all national emergencies.

It is absolutely essential that our Navy be in condition and prepared at all times. It must ever remain in a state of readiness, for, in the event of national emergency, it can not wait to be prepared, but must be prepared at the time to cope with the emergency.

The facts surrounding the construction of the remaining three cruisers authorized in the act of 1924 are, indeed, interesting.

The President, in his annual message to Congress on December 7, said:

Attention should be given to submarines, cruisers, and air forces.

That portion of the President's message dealing with the Navy was referred to the Naval Affairs Committee. It, therefore, became our duty to look into the situation.

An investigation disclosed the fact that we had only 10 cruisers that were built under 15 years of age, 2 in the process of being built, and 3 appropriated for, but no contract entered into for their building; that the total tonnage of the 15 cruisers built, building, and appropriated for was 125,000 tons.

An examination of the status of the cruiser strength of Great Britain disclosed that this nation had 40 cruisers under 15 years of age, 11 being built, and 3 appropriated for, making 54 in all, with a total tonnage of 332,290 tons; that Japan had 19 cruisers under 15 years of age and was building 6, making in all 25 cruisers, with a total tonnage of 156,205 tons.

The Budget message submitted to Congress by the Chief Executive recommended that the time limit for the construction of the 3 remaining cruisers of the 1924 building program be extended, and therefore made no recommendation for appropriation for their contracting prior to July 1, 1927.

As we all recall, the House refused in January to make appropriation for the laying down of the remaining 3 cruisers.

Immediately thereafter the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee proposed a bill extending the time

limit of the 3 cruisers unappropriated for, for one year. This proposed bill was sent to the Navy Department for their comment, and at the same time the chairman introduced a bill authorizing a new cruiser program providing for the construction of 10 light cruisers. This measure likewise was sent to the Navy Department.

The Director of the Budget advised the Navy Department that the extension of the time limit in which to build the remaining 3 cruisers of the 1924 program would be in conflict with the financial program of the President, but that the bill that had been introduced by the chairman authorizing the construction of 10 cruisers was not in conflict with the financial program of the President.

Bear this one thing in mind: In December the Budget message recommended that the time limit be extended. Within a month the Budget changed its position, and in January it recommended not to extend the time limit—that to do so would be in conflict with the financial program of the Executive. The extension of the time limit of the 3 cruisers would not entail any cost whatsoever. Yet, on the other hand, a bill entailing an expenditure of over \$150,000,000, authorizing the construction of 10 cruisers, met with the sanction of the Budget and was within the financial program of the Executive.

One day we are told to extend the time limit on the 3 cruisers; the next report on the subject matter we are told not to extend the time limit, but to commence a new program authorizing Congress to build 10 cruisers.

It is said by some that the building of the three cruisers provided for in the Senate amendment will embark this Government in competitive building and is militaristic in its character. Was it competitive building in 1924, when we authorized them? Was it militaristic to pass that law? If it was not competitive building in 1924, when we authorized the building of eight cruisers, five of which have already been laid down or contracted for, how can it be competitive building to finish that program?

If it is militaristic now to finish the building provided for by the act of 1924, it was militaristic when we passed the law. If it is competitive building and militaristic to adopt the Senate amendment, I respectfully ask you how you classify the authorization of the 10 cruisers which has the sanction of the President?

If the building of 3 is competitive, what is the authorization to building the 10? When did it become competitive building for this Government to lay down ships to balance and round out our Navy?

I assert that it was not competitive building in 1924, when we authorized these cruisers; it is not competitive building now; was not militaristic then and is not militaristic now.

That kind of contention, Mr. Speaker, is but an excuse by which some seek to justify their refusal to maintain the Navy in the strength that the needs of the Government require it to be.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it highly important to make reference briefly to the obstacle that confronted the preparatory commission for disarmament which assembled at Geneva under the auspices of the League of Nations for the reduction or limitation of armaments.

Nineteen nations assembled, each represented by one commissioner to the preparatory conference, and up to the time of adjournment no agreement could be reached by the representatives as to the method of comparison. Fourteen nations were wedded to the Global method or the interdependence of armaments—that is, that all three categories of arms must be considered together under one limitation program. Five nations—the United States, Great Britain, Japan, Chile, and Argentina—subscribed to a different method of comparison—that each arm, the army, navy, and the air, be treated separately.

France and Italy, as well as all other nations of continental Europe, subscribed to the Global method of limitation of navy armaments. They insisted upon the interdependence of land, sea, and air forces. Confronted with such an obstacle as the inability to reach a method of comparison, the preparatory commission adjourned to meet again some time this year.

The President addressed a communication to the four other great maritime nations—England, Japan, France, and Italy—inviting a conference to meet at Geneva for the limitation or reduction of naval armaments.

Seeking to carry out the principles that were applied at the Washington conference to auxiliary vessels, the President stated:

The American Government for its part is disposed to accept in regard to those classes of vessels not covered by the Washington treaty, an extension of the 5-5-3 ratio as regards the United States, Great Britain, and Japan.

I.XVIII—296

Congressman BURTON, of Ohio, on January 7 said:

I can very readily conceive that she [Great Britain] needs a larger navy than the United States and I do not object to her building a larger number of cruisers than we have.

And Mr. Green of Iowa, on the same date said:

England has more cruisers, but it needs three times as many.

Therefore the position of the President in regard to fixing the ratio of the auxiliary vessels is indeed reassuring that our Navy will not, by treaty agreement, be below that of Great Britain, and 5 to 3 to Japan, notwithstanding the remarks of these two distinguished gentlemen.

The President is to be commended for his efforts to bring about a limitation of navy armaments, and, in my humble judgment, he has applied the correct ratio.

Therefore, the ratio for capital ships agreed upon by the Washington conference, as far as this Government is concerned, becomes the ratio for auxiliary vessels.

Mr. Speaker, my position on this question is that until we have reached an agreement limiting naval armament in auxiliary vessels, it is the duty of Congress to see that this country has a navy equal to that of any other navy.

We can not afford to have a navy second to that of any other country. However, it is to be hoped that in the near future the nations of the earth, through the preliminary commission at Geneva, or by the proposal of the President, will reach an agreement limiting the maximum tonnage of auxiliary vessels, but, sir, until that is done, it is our duty to have a navy of sufficient strength to be able to cope with the navy of any other nation.

However, I am frank to confess that I can see but little hope of an agreement being reached by the preliminary Geneva conference, due to the inability of the 19 nations to agree upon a method of comparison. Fourteen of the 19 nations are wedded to the interdependence of arms, or Global method of comparison.

It is also to be regretted that the outlook is by no means bright for any agreement to be reached under the President's plan, for France and Italy have rejected the proposal as they are committed to the method of the Global theory, or interdependence of arms. However, it is in the realms of possibility that England, Japan, and the United States might enter into an agreement with reference to auxiliary vessels.

Let us assume for the sake of argument that such an agreement is possible, but let us at the very threshold understand the situation. The President has committed this Government that the ratio should be 5-5 to Great Britain and 3 to Japan in all auxiliary vessels.

Let us assume that the cruiser strength of Great Britain is to be the maximum tonnage allowed on cruiser construction. Let us see what the situation is. Great Britain has 54 cruisers under 15 years of age, with a total tonnage of 332,290.

If that tonnage is made the standard, then the United States, to maintain the ratio of 5-5 with Great Britain, would be entitled to construct 21 cruisers of 10,000 tons each, or an additional tonnage of 210,000, making a total of 36 cruisers in all.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. YATES. Do I understand the gentleman to say that we would have to build 21 cruisers to be equal with England?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. YATES. That is a very serious statement.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; and I presume the distinguished gentleman from Illinois is willing to follow the President's standard of the ratio, which is 5-5 so far as England and the United States are concerned.

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If he does follow it, then it is necessary that this country have a navy equal to that of Great Britain.

Mr. YATES. I am willing to vote for the three cruisers.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the present strength of Great Britain is accepted as the standard, then Japan, upon the basis of 5 to 3, would be entitled to an additional tonnage of 43,169 tons, or four additional cruisers, giving to her 29 cruisers in all.

I deem it important at this point to quote to you a portion of the British naval policy, which says:

The one-power standard, however, is the standard which refers to the strength of the fighting fleets as measured in capital ships. There can be no similar rough-and-ready standard for cruisers and small crafts, the requirements in respect to which, apart from the proper complement of fighting fleet, must depend upon the peculiar defense problem of each power.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Baldwin, said:

We can not allow, and we will not allow, any weakening at present of the defensive forces of the Empire. We stand for a one-power navy sufficiently equipped with cruisers to protect our trade routes and sufficiently equipped bases throughout the world to make our fleet mobile and capable of action wherever the call may come from.

In view of this policy, taking into consideration England's position in the state of the world, her location, her trade routes and colonies, and being dependent for her national existence upon her import trade, there are no facts upon which to base a hope that Great Britain will consent at any time to any material reduction in her cruiser strength, especially in view of the fact that other nations of continental Europe have refused to participate in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, now, on the other hand, let us assume for the sake of argument that the standard agreed upon by England, Japan, and the United States would be the present strength of our 15 cruisers, or 125,000 tons. Let us see what would be the results of such a standard as that being fixed as the maximum tonnage in cruisers.

Now, listen: England has 40 cruisers over 15 years of age in commission, of a total tonnage of 194,290 tons. In addition to that she is building 11 cruisers of 110,000 tons, and has appropriated for three cruisers of 28,000 tons. If our cruiser strength is accepted as the standard, England would have to scrap 207,290 tons of cruisers.

In other words, she would have to scrap every one of her 40 cruisers in commission, as the tonnage of these ships only amounts to 194,290 tons, and in addition thereto she would have to scrap 13,000 more tons, or one of the cruisers that she is building, making 41 cruisers that she would be forced to put out of commission to equal our tonnage, leaving her only 10 cruisers being built and 3 appropriated for.

Japan would have to scrap, if our present strength is accepted as the standard, based upon the ratio of 5 to 3, 81,205 tons, or, in other words, take out of commission 8 cruisers.

The contention of the Japanese Premier, as expressed in the Associated Press dispatch, is that Japan can not reduce her cruiser strength, as her 25 cruisers are necessary for her national defense. So, therefore, let us assume that the tonnage of Japan's 25 cruisers would be made the standard, which is 156,205 tons. If that amount of tonnage is made the standard, then England would have to scrap 71,950 tons and the United States would be entitled to build 135,340 tons, or 13 cruisers.

Is there a man within the sound of my voice who for one moment believes that the present cruiser strength of the United States will be agreed upon as the maximum tonnage that will be permitted in cruiser construction?

The naval policy of Great Britain, which I have quoted, shows conclusively that she would never consent to fixing as a standard of cruiser strength the present tonnage of the United States.

The Premier of Japan states that the—

present military and naval forces are necessary to maintain and protect Japan's existing positions and rights—

and the naval policy of Japan is to counteract the United States 5-3 advantages in capital ships by acquiring an equality ratio in auxiliary vessels.

Do you for one moment believe that Japan would be willing or the Japanese people would ever consent to scrapping eight of her cruisers?

Let me call your attention to the comments of the British Admiralty. It is—

that in America's case, having no naval construction in hand, she is not in a position to offer adequate cuts in return for the sweeping concessions other countries are invited to make.

The British statesmen at the Washington conference adhered to the viewpoint of the experts of the British Admiralty. Likewise the voice of the British experts will be heard in a future conference. By listening to the voice of her naval experts, the British Admiralty, through her statesmen, provided in the Washington conference for the scrapping of four old battleships and replacing them with two of the most modern ships in the world.

How different was it with us. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] said, "statesmen had to overrule the experts" at the Washington conference.

Had our statesmen adhered to the viewpoint of our naval experts, we would have saved over \$32,000,000 that Congress has been called upon to expend on the old ships with 12-inch guns that the American statesmen permitted us to keep, which our naval experts insisted should be scrapped.

The British statesmen at all conferences value the viewpoint of her naval experts, and with the British Admiralty maintaining that we are not in position to offer adequate cuts in return for sweeping concessions other countries are invited to make, clearly indicates to my mind that her naval experts' viewpoint will not be overridden in any future conference by her statesmen.

Why were we able at the Washington conference in 1922 to secure an agreement?

It was because we had 32 ships of a total tonnage of 842,380 tons that we were willing to scrap if England and Japan would scrap 38 ships of a total tonnage of 802,459 tons.

When we come to another conference we have no cruisers that we can offer to scrap. It would be absurd to offer that we would scrap destroyers if they would scrap cruisers, for each particular type of ship is treated separately and independently.

There can be no escape from the conclusion that we would have to build cruisers if England's or Japan's tonnage was made the standard. It is absurd for one moment to think that we can get Great Britain or Japan to reduce to our tonnage.

I can see no escape from the conclusion that the only sound and rational course for this Government to pursue at this time is to authorize the immediate construction of the three remaining cruisers of the 1924 program. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] is recognized.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, there is just one question in my mind relative to this controversy, and that is whether or not we intend to aid the President in trying to bring about another conference for the limitation of armaments.

I shall take but a few minutes to explain, as one of the conferees, why I am unable to agree with the Senate amendment which provides for this appropriation for the construction of these three cruisers at this time. I do not intend to discuss or even refer to the size or efficiency of our Navy as compared with the navies of other countries. In passing, however, it is but fair to say, when one listens to some of the speeches delivered in both branches of Congress on this question and reads many of the articles appearing in magazines and the press telling of the deplorable condition of our Navy, it would lead a panicky person to believe and feel that we had no Navy, and further that we might expect at any time to be in war with some great naval power. So far as I am concerned, I want to say, using the language of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], that I do not let the nightmare keep me awake at night or stimulate me to talk in daytime to the effect that something is needed for the protection of America.

I want it distinctly understood that I always have been and am now in favor of an adequate navy. It is frequently referred to as the Nation's first line of defense, and I am in favor of keeping that first line of defense intact; nor would I do a thing that would have a tendency to cripple the Navy.

To hear some of the gentlemen who are insisting upon this appropriation at this time, admittedly for the sole purpose of extending the authorization for these three cruisers, one would think that if it was not done it would so weaken our Navy that the United States would become a fourth or fifth rate naval power. Permit me to say there is no disposition on the part of this committee or any member of it to postpone indefinitely the appropriation for these three cruisers. Speaking for myself, as one member of the committee, I am in favor not only of appropriating for these three cruisers but also constructing others, and will go as far as any member, within reason, to maintain our position among the nations as a first-rate naval power. But that is not the question involved in this controversy. The question here to be determined is, Are we going to show the proper consideration and regard for the wishes and requests of the President of the United States?

It is unnecessary to enter into a discussion of the duties of the different branches of our Federal Government. It is enough to say that, by reason of his position, the President is the Nation's spokesman on international affairs; that he is charged with the responsibility of carrying on negotiations with foreign nations pertaining to the welfare of this Nation when foreign affairs are involved [applause], and when I say the President is charged with this responsibility I make the further statement it makes no difference to me whether that Executive's name be Woodrow Wilson or Calvin Coolidge. [Applause.]

Congress has recognized this fact on two or three occasions on the very subject now under discussion. Permit me to call your attention that in 1916 we requested the President to call together in international conference the nations, looking to the limitation of armaments. The same declaration was made by Congress in 1924 and again in 1925, requesting the present Executive, Mr. Coolidge, to call the nations together in such conference for the same purpose. We have requested President Coolidge twice to use his good offices, looking to the calling of another conference to bring about, if possible, a further limitation of armaments.

Why did we ask him to do it? Congress did not have the power and authority to do it, so it had to call on the only one who has that authority. The President is endeavoring to comply with these requests of Congress. He is acting in good faith, and has called our attention to the fact that Congress could embarrass him in these endeavors by appropriating money at this time to begin the construction of these three cruisers. Within the past 60 days he has said:

This country is now engaged in negotiations to broaden our existing treaties with the great powers which deal with the elimination or competition in naval armaments. I feel that it would be unfortunate at this time and not in keeping with our attitude toward these negotiations to commence the construction of these three cruisers; rather do I recommend to the Congress the enactment of legislation which will extend the time for beginning their construction.

[Applause.]

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Is there any intimation that the President has either changed his mind or is of the same mind?

Mr. AYRES. He is of the same mind.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. He is of the same mind in the light of recent experience?

Mr. AYRES. Yes, sir; without a question of a doubt.

Our committee proposed to the Senate conferees to provide in this measure for the extension of the authorization of these cruisers. What more could be desired, and at the same time be fair with the President? This is a question that ought to be above politics, but I regret to say I am not so sure it is being so considered, and in making this statement I am not referring to a political controversy between Democrats in Congress and a Republican President. Since this question has been under consideration, enough has been said and done by the leaders of the President's own political party to convince even a casual observer that several moves have been made on the political chessboard of the President's own party. In this I may be mistaken and sincerely hope so, for I still maintain that this is a question that should be considered above politics.

I would like, at this time, to call attention of my Democratic colleagues to the time when President Wilson cabled from Europe to Secretary Daniels, in substance, that nothing had taken place at the Peace Conference to cause him to change his mind regarding the completion of the then naval program. He asked that his recommendations regarding this naval program be carried out and did not want it postponed. After many days of debate, this House, by the overwhelming majority of 280 to 50 sustained President Wilson.

Mr. Coolidge has said nothing has occurred to cause him to change his mind regarding the postponement of the appropriation for these three cruisers, and that it might embarrass him for us to disregard his wishes in the matter. For one, I want to say most emphatically that I shall not take the inconsistent position of voting to sustain one President on a question of this kind and then decline to sustain another President on practically the same matter. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ANDREW].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the question before us is clear and clean-cut. It is whether or not we are to confirm the abandonment of the 5-5-3 ratio.

The people of the United States are preeminently a peace-loving people. We have no grudges to settle. We have no lost territory to recover. We have no ambition to expand.

Nevertheless, I believe that there is a deep-rooted and well-grounded conviction throughout every section of the land that we should have a Navy as strong as that of any other country. There is no reason why we should accept an inferior position. We are not poor. We can afford to hold our own. We want to save money, to be sure, but not by establishing a reputation for weakness. As a people we are not subservient. We are not

inclined to depend upon others to protect our rights. In fact, we have established no such relations of good will either in Europe or in this hemisphere or in the Orient or anywhere else as would justify our relying upon others to safeguard our vast and widely scattered interests. If the experience of a decade ago is worth anything, it means that we can only hope to see our rights respected and to avoid trouble if we are known to be well prepared.

When in 1922 our representatives in the Washington conference sacrificed the naval supremacy that was then plainly ours, it was, I think, rightfully assumed by our people that inferiority was not being accepted in its stead. When they voluntarily consigned to the scrap heap 11 of the latest and costliest ships then approaching completion and 30 ships all together, upon which we had spent more than \$300,000,000, with a displacement of more than 800,000 tons, we made a sacrifice much greater than that made by both Great Britain and Japan combined. It was one of the most altruistic actions ever made by any nation, and it was one of the most self-forgetful and blindly trusting. We had at that time a marked advantage in battleships, and Great Britain had an advantage in the swifter armored cruisers. We relinquished our advantage in the one, without asking for a like relinquishment in the other. We did not ask in exchange, as we were then in a position to do, that the British and Japanese cruiser strength should not be increased out of all proportion to our own.

Although the treaty specifically referred only to the capital ships, those of more than 10,000 tons, our people accepted it as understood that our fleet as a whole should remain of equal strength with that of Great Britain and in a relation of 5 to 3 with that of Japan. As an evidence of our good faith, we have yielded to every protest in the matter of the battleships. We have refrained for five years from raising the elevation of the guns upon these ships, despite the fact that all but a few of our battleships are outranged by the entire British fleet, and that this inferiority could be easily corrected by so arranging our guns that they could fire at a higher angle. We have refrained from making the change notwithstanding that no other country but Great Britain has objected, and despite the fact that Secretary Hughes himself conceded that it was admissible under the terms of the treaty.

In the matter of auxiliary ships, which were not specifically named in the treaty, we have scrupulously followed the spirit of that treaty, which we assumed to limit competition in naval armament of every sort. Since the conference we have laid down only two cruisers and three fleet submarines. But now we wake up to find that while we have been building these 2 cruisers Great Britain has been building 11 (five times as many) and Japan has been building 6, and that while we have begun only 3 fleet submarines, Great Britain has undertaken 9 and Japan 17.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, may I have two minutes more? Mr. BUTLER. Will the House give me just half a minute in which to say this? I surrendered all the time I had allotted to myself and my colleagues, but I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. ANDREW. While the United States in the five years following the conference made appropriations for only 16 naval vessels of all classes, Great Britain laid down or appropriated for more than twice as many—37 in all—and Japan laid down or appropriated for more than seven times as many, namely, 116.

The main result of the naval treaty, therefore, was not "to relieve the world of the burden of naval armament," as was suggested in the opening words of the treaty, not to reduce the extravagant expense of competitive naval construction as the American people supposed, but to substitute for the primacy of the American fleet which we had bought and paid for and which was manifestly ours—a naval strength increasingly inferior to that of Great Britain and in important respects even inferior to that of Japan.

What has become of the 5-5-3 ratio, if, in so far as these swift armored cruisers are concerned, when all of the cruisers now appropriated for have been completed we shall occupy a position far inferior even to that of Japan? With these vessels constructed, the cruiser strength of the three countries will stand as follows:

	Tons
United States, 15 cruisers, with a total displacement of.....	125,000
Japanese Empire, 25 cruisers, with a total displacement of.....	150,000
British Empire, 54 cruisers, with a total displacement of.....	332,000

Should we to-day appropriate for these three cruisers, which were authorized by Congress and the President three years ago,

our cruiser strength will still be less than half that of Great Britain and not equal to Japan's; and if we were actually to appropriate for 10 additional cruisers, which it has only been suggested that we authorize, our cruiser strength would still fall short of Great Britain's by more than 77,000 tons.

Is anyone simple-minded enough to believe that Great Britain or Japan at any conference is going to scrap its cruisers or bring its fleet down to the 5-5-3 ratio with ours?

Gentlemen, if our neighbors are willing to take advantage of America's matchless idealism in the Washington conference, if they are determined to follow only the letter and to overlook the spirit of the Washington treaty, we may as well let them know that our national security demands that we meet them on their own terms. This is the decision made by the Senate which it now devolves upon us to confirm. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, just to get the bells rung and the signal given in the cloakrooms.

Mr. BURTON. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas withdraw his point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not insist upon it. I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, it is desirable to recognize the futility of naval programs, even for naval warfare. In 1904 I addressed the House and mentioned the high-sounding names of certain British warships, the *Colossus*, the *Powerful*, the *Thunderer*, the *Terrible*. Their very names were sufficient to drive timid souls into the interior and to bring a long row of persons here to ask that the Treasury doors be burst open to construct a mammoth navy.

Oh, where are warships now, erstwhile that went and came? Fleets of them are on the scrap heap, and so far as I know, not a single one of the quartet mentioned ever fired a single shot against the enemy. Thus most of the preparations and plans for navies have proved their futility.

What is the main reason? It is due to the rapidly changing types of vessels, to the successive revolutions in methods of warfare. I myself can remember the time when the ironclad *Merrimac* came out from Norfolk and destroyed the wooden ships, the *Cumberland* and the *Congress*, and I can recall the agony of suspense that held over the North for a day; but on the following day the *Monitor* came into the contest—"the Yankee cheesebox on a raft," as it was called by the Confederates. The *Monitor* drove back the *Merrimac* to her port. Then there was a change in naval warfare. Monitors were introduced. Wooden ships were made ironclad and soon after steel ships displaced all others.

Thus year by year there has been a revolution in naval warfare, which is by no means complete to-day. And in other warfare the changes have been equally marked. Let me not omit the destroyers and the submarines, with their wonderful power of destruction, and fixed as well as floating mines. Then last of all, aerial warfare; and I think I am not exaggerating, my friends, when I hold out to you the strong probability that aerial warfare will prevail on land and sea; that airplanes though some may fail or be stricken down, like wolves on a buffalo, will destroy with heavy bombs the mightiest battleship in the world. [Applause.]

The net result of recent developments has been that capacity for defensive warfare has increased much more than that for offensive warfare.

Thus it is for us to be moderate in our plans for naval expansion, bearing in mind what the future has in store.

The next point I want to make is this: Our Navy, when every variety of craft is considered, is by no means effete or inferior to that of any nation. It is strong enough for purposes of defense and measurably for offense. We are equal, if not superior, to any country in the world in our battleships. They are superior in that all in a few months will be oil burners, while at least five of the battleships of Great Britain are coal burners. Everyone of our battleships and, as I understand, also our cruisers, is furnished with a catapult and with airplanes, which can be used at any place on the sea, while Great Britain, with one exception, has not the catapult or airplanes.

Then, further, what nation could attack us with our equipment of submarines, superior in number and power to those of any other nation on the globe, and with our equipment of destroyers, to which we may add the mine? Our coasts are safe for purposes of defense.

It is generally conceded by naval officers that the submarine is the best weapon for defense, and therefore, as stated by Captain Stirling, the best weapon for our strategic position is a flotilla of submarines "ambushed" across the path of the approaching enemy, their movements coordinated and directed by a commander on board a vessel of the fleet. These would work havoc on the hostile vessels. Conversely, the destroyer is the greatest menace to the submarine, so our preponderance in this type insures us against submarine attack.

I make this further statement: The people of the United States, when they calmly consider our situation and the policies we should adopt, will not stand behind the Congress in any measure which looks like offensive warfare. I make that statement without fear of contradiction. We covet no outlying portions of the earth. We do not wish to attack any other country. More than any other nation our foreign policy has been dictated by motives of altruism. Heaven knows we have the land of promise, the most favored in the world, already in our possession. The protection required for our citizens abroad is in countries which either possess no navy or one of very inferior quality. Why, then, consider this idea of a mighty navy? As I have already detailed, that which we have, with the reinforcement of mines and other means, is ample for our defense. No country in the world could attack us.

What, with submarines, destroyers, mines, coast-defense guns, and then squadrons of airplane bombers, it would amount almost to foolhardiness.

It has been the ambitious thought of some that we should have a navy which should surpass any other. If there should be a combination of all the navies of the world against us perhaps our ships might be swept from the sea, but such a combination is impossible. A combination against the United States was the dream of Louis Napoleon during the Civil War; it was the aim of certain nations in the Spanish-American War, and yet both failed.

It is a waste of time to argue that our Navy should be equal to that of the English Navy. How different our situation. I dwelt on that on the 7th of January and will not long dwell upon it again. I simply state it is impossible that we should have war with England. Yet, with her widespread and far-flung possessions, the necessity of protecting her dominions, and with her dependence on the outside world for food and necessary supplies, she needs a navy greater than that of the United States.

I do not say the time will never come when it will be necessary for us to build up to the 5-5-3 ratio on cruisers, but at this present time it is altogether unnecessary. There is no threat of war against us. Other nations of the world are impoverished, weary of war, and they do not think of attacking us. What if France and Italy are seeking to build a larger number of cruisers? The most ambitious program of those two countries would not provide a navy equal to our own. They have not the resources; and shall we involve ourselves, strong, powerful, and rich as we are, in the jealousies, the quarrels, and animosities which prevail between other countries? We have no desire to engage in contest with any other nation. We have no long-standing animosities to gratify by warfare. We are here isolated but respected by the rest of the world, and so far as fear is concerned there is a salutary fear of the United States because of our power.

Two arguments for an appropriation for the three cruisers are manifestly fallacious.

The first is that under the agreements adopted at the Washington Conference the ratio of 5-5-3, applicable for battleships, is equally applicable for cruisers and that we should maintain a cruiser fleet equal to that of England and two-thirds greater than that of Japan. The Washington agreements, at the very most, confer a privilege, which we may exercise or not, as we please; they do not impose upon us an obligation. The question should be decided on the basis of our national requirements, and these should be influenced by a desire for world peace and a proper balance of expenditures for the various departments and activities of the Government. Neither the protection of our coasts nor the promotion and protection of our commerce require at this time additional cruisers.

No one can claim that our Navy has been neglected. It is maintained at a high standard of efficiency. Annual expenditures upon it by the United States are greater than those of England—approximately \$324,000,000 by the United States and \$291,000,000 by England, according to the latest budget. We expend more than the combined amount, as carried in the latest budgets, by France, Italy, and Japan, whose total expenditures are \$193,416,836; more than Japan and Italy expend upon both their armies and navies combined.

The second argument is that if we build a large fleet of cruisers we shall have something to trade. It is altogether

irrational to embark upon an extremely expensive building program with the thought of scrapping warships. It is universally recognized that the United States has the financial resources to far outstrip any other nation in the creation of a navy. In any conference, this argument would be altogether sufficient. Again, if we should enter into negotiations for a limitation of armaments, limitation of our own would afford a proof of sincerity which would be much more effective than the possession of a larger fleet.

Let me take up an expression from one of our naval officers on the subject of cruisers, but first let me read something in confirmation of what I have said in regard to submarines; again quoting Capt. Yates Stirling, now a rear admiral and one of the ablest of our naval officers. He said:

Battleships and battle cruisers, the monarchs of the sea, are as helpless before the submarine as a prize fighter is helpless before a burglar with an automatic pistol drawn. Our submarines could drive from our coasts the very largest fleet of battleships and cruisers.

Lieutenant Commander Gill says of the battle cruiser:

The chief utility of the battle cruiser is now held to be that of a scout and raider.

Do we require any raiders or scouts? Do we wish to drive the commerce of any other country from the sea? There are some who make the argument, which to me is most absurd, that our cruisers are necessary to promote our commerce. With what country of the world have we increased our commerce by the force of cruisers or by the threat of reprisals? The promotion of our commerce and the expansion of our trade must come from peaceful relations, and the threat of the utilization of cruisers or any form of warcraft will injure rather than aid our position in trade relations with the rest of the world. [Applause.]

Now, let me recapitulate. Our Navy is strong, though maybe the time will come when we shall wish to make it stronger; but that is not now. Our Navy is amply sufficient for defense. We do not wish to promote quarrels or a fight with any nation, and we do not need to enlarge our Navy for the promotion of our country's interests. Oh, but so many say—and that is oftentimes the chatter of the advocates of large armies and navies—"we are doing all this as a matter of defense." How similar that is to that paragon of hypocrites, Uriah Heep, when he said, "We know we are very humble, sir, but we are afraid that other people that are not humble will get the start of us." [Applause.] You will not deceive anybody by the claim that it is for defense alone. It means ambition, and it may be towering ambition. It means a disposition to gain by force that which a nation can only gain by the arts of peace and by peaceful negotiation. Secretary Hughes uttered a sentiment in the conference of 1921-22, at the very beginning, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues, for it was received with almost thunderous applause—"Preparation for offensive naval war will stop now."

This should be the platform of the United States. This country should prove the pathfinder, an example for the world, in looking toward peace [applause], and in no way can we gain that position or become established more firmly than by voting down the Senate amendments and by declaring to the world that America, amid the din, amid the threat of war, stands as on the eternal rock for good will, for peace with all the nations of the earth. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], in his very earnest address, intimated that those of us who voted for this motion were largely affected by our proximity to naval establishments. I come from a district that is 140 miles from the sea, that has no navy yard, and no connection with any navy yard. We are a peaceable people, but believe in a businesslike, well-worked-out and followed program of national defense and national preparedness. [Applause.]

We believed in this in 1924, when this act was passed, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio intimates that to do this now is an open, avowed preparation for war or assault upon somebody. Well, if it is, the distinguished gentleman's party put through this measure in 1924, expressly providing what we are doing here to-day, and the President of the United States, who happened to be Mr. Coolidge, who is now President, signed it and put it into operation. I believe the time has come when there are no party lines in this proposition, and the reference a while ago to the fact there were leaders on

the Republican side who are differing with the President has nothing to do with it. All of us are attempting to do what we think is best for this country, and we should maintain the rights of this country regardless of any misunderstanding. [Applause.]

But how is this interfering with the prerogatives or the program of the President? We are merely carrying out what was determined by the Congress should be done before the first day of July, 1927, and we are putting in the hands of the President the power to do it, if it is necessary and if nothing intervenes that will prevent it. But the very act under which he acts releases his hands if there is any reason why he should do this. Read the last clause of the act:

That in the event of an international conference for the limitation of naval armaments, the President is hereby empowered, in his discretion, to suspend in whole or in part any or all alterations or construction authorized in this act.

Now, if we put the money to his credit, where have we interfered with his program? If he has not the backbone to suspend it, if he sees it is proper for the promotion of the peace of this country to suspend it, then it is his default and not ours. We have laid in his hands the program and the power and the resources with which to carry out this program which he himself has approved, and if in his judgment it is best for the country that it should not be done, then he can exercise his judgment and we have discharged our duty.

I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that it is not the responsibility of the President to maintain and create the defensive armament of this country. Somebody said here we must do like the President says. The responsibility of providing the machinery of war, the responsibility of providing the machinery of defense, the responsibility of providing all the equipment that is necessary is upon the Congress, and when they have made such provision the President can use it or not as he sees fit, and he expressly has that right under the very act under which we are proceeding.

If you take the gentleman from Ohio at his word, we would never build any more ships for fear some man would come along and find a way to destroy them. This is the argument of the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman said:

Why, they all go down in the long run, and, forsooth, the air fleet will soon destroy all of them, so why build them?

This is the argument of the gentleman from Ohio. You might as well abolish the arming of the police of this city because they do not shoot anybody more than once every six months. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] made three or four startling statements which I think should be emphasized for the benefit of the House.

In the first place, the gentleman bewailed the erstwhile Navy of 1904, which finally went down to destruction in the scrap heap without ever having fired a shot. Why not go a little further and cry over the thousands of millions of dollars in insurance policies covering accident, fire, and automobile insurance on which never a dollar was collected? They finally found their way to the wastebasket.

This is exactly what a navy is for. It is a great national insurance policy.

The gentleman from Ohio said, with every confidence and self-assurance, that our Navy is adequate. The best expert advice in the world, in England, Japan, America, France, and Italy, says that we are far below the 5-5-3 ratio established at the Washington conference. In the very spirit of that conference we are way below that ratio, and in this respect the United States is herself violating the Washington treaty. We have consistently refused to live up to that historic conference. We have refused to appropriate accordingly.

Then the gentleman said a remarkable thing—he could see no reason why we should have a Navy as great as England's. There is the effect of British social diplomacy. The gentleman goes to Europe every year. He says "we ought not to have a Navy as great as England. No; England has an immense commerce and outlying possessions and England is a great nation, and, of course, should have a navy greater than ours." How ridiculous! In the next breath he says, "I am told by a naval officer that these cruisers are to protect commerce. How much commerce have we ever gained," he said, "with the assistance of cruisers?" In one breath England needs a navy for the

protection of her commerce and in the next breath we do not need it for protection of ours. How ridiculous. He says, referring to the great submarines, that a naval officer said that they would dash upon a battleship and blow it to smithereens. The merest schoolboy knows that is a ridiculous statement. The submarine is the pirate of the sea; it attacks the defenseless vessel and runs away from any ship carrying a gun. We had that demonstrated throughout the World War. During the entire World War not a single battleship was sunk by a submarine.

Now, I would like to call this situation to the careful attention of my colleagues. Every speaker in opposing the amendment offered by my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] used the argument that we should stand by the President. The gentleman from the other side of the House, Mr. AYRES, and a member of the conference committee, even read the President's Budget statement of February 8, requesting a delay in the construction of these cruisers until a conference might be had, with a view to the limitation of naval armament.

Now, let me call to your attention that the situation to-day is not at all the same as it was when we had the question before us a month ago, and the amendment was defeated by a very small margin. To-day we are in possession of the fact that the President has called a conference and that his invitation had been declined. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, when the question of appropriating for three cruisers was before the House a month ago it was combated by a statement from the President, which said:

This country is now engaged in negotiations to broaden our existing treaties with the great powers which deal with the elimination of competition in naval armaments. I feel that it would be unfortunate at this time and not in keeping with our attitude toward these negotiations to commence the construction of these three cruisers. Rather do I recommend to the Congress the enactment of legislation which will extend the time for beginning their construction.

And was defeated by a close margin.

To-day we are confronted by an entirely different situation. The President has since invited the four other great naval powers to meet with us for the limitation of armament in the classes of vessels not covered by the Washington treaty, and three of the four have politely declined.

France says she will not enter a limitation conference outside of the one already called by the League of Nations for limitation of all character of armament, and then only when the total physical and economical resources of a country are considered a part of the national defense.

Mussolini says that Italy's long coast line and her interest in Mediterranean commerce makes it impossible for her to even think of agreeing to a limitation on cruisers and submarines.

Japan accepts, with the clear understanding that it is not the American intention to put forward the 5-3 ratio of naval strength and that we should keep an open mind concerning the defensive requirements of each other.

With all the rest refusing to enter President Coolidge's conference, it will be sweet diplomacy for Great Britain to accept, knowing that there can be no negotiations.

The President has shown the world his sincere desire for a disarmament conference, and the rest of the world has sidestepped the invitation.

The American people now expect this Congress to maintain our Navy on an effective basis, and at least in the ratio agreed upon at the Washington conference.

American lives and American interests throughout the world demand this form of protection.

Mr. Speaker, all other great powers are building powerful, well-balanced navies to meet their particular needs, while we are falling behind in efficiency, tonnage, and actual sea power.

This means loss of prestige at home and abroad, and as commerce has always followed the flag, I fear a loss of America's great export trade.

The United States can not remain a first-class power among the nations without actually being one.

A blue-print navy and a volunteer army offers little backing for a rich nation of strong principles and policies.

It has long been a settled policy of this country not to make war, and the best way to make this desire effective is to have a navy of sufficient strength to support our policies and our commerce and to guard our continental and overseas possessions.

This is not wasteful competition, it is sound insurance for peace.

Congress is expected to keep our Navy up to the Washington treaty standard in such vitally essential respects as fighting men and fighting ships, and when it fails to do so it merits the severest criticism.

Certainly our Navy should be second to none, and yet we are so far behind England and Japan in cruiser strength that our position is shameful. In 1931 Great Britain will have 54, Japan 25, and the United States 15 cruisers.

With most of the world's commerce, gold, industry, and wealth and so little national protection, it is well said that we are living in a fool's paradise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague [Mr. UPDIKE] five minutes.

Mr. UPDIKE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I hope the Members of the House will not consider that I am in favor of the building program for our Navy simply because I have had military service, but at this time we are face to face with a great responsibility, namely, that of maintaining an adequate national defense for the protection of our present citizens—also, the happiness and welfare of our future generation—and with the assurance of maintaining a world peace. Our responsibility is great; yet we who are charged with that responsibility should proceed without fear with a definite policy, always keeping in mind permanent peace as our objective. I am sure the greatest insurance policy that the United States Government can have is to maintain a navy that is capable of defending and preserving peace and further stabilize the peace of the world. I am sure you would not say that I favor this program because of navy yards or ship yards in my district, because I am nearly 800 miles from the coast line and represent one of the largest inland cities in the world. We have made repeated attempts for a further limitation of armaments, but without success. It is reasonable to presume that there is no chance at the present time for a limitation of armaments, especially when nations such as Poland, Finland, Switzerland, and others are given the same voice as the United States when, in fact, they have no navy, but who cast their influences with the European powers.

Only a few days ago an appropriation bill was brought upon the floor of this House appropriating \$75,000 to send delegates to the Geneva conference. I spoke in favor of this appropriation at that time, but stated that I doubted the ultimate results and benefits we would derive, but I thought that this Government should declare to the world her good faith in the limitation of armaments if they would come in and agree on a program. I further doubted that we could accomplish anything, in view of the fact that this conference was held under the auspices of the League of Nations, of which I have no confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I am just as much opposed to the entering into a competitive building program with other nations as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] or the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]. But I do not believe that this Nation should abandon her Navy program under the pretense of setting an example for other nations, especially when they have demonstrated clearly that they are not willing to follow our example, but, on the contrary, have gone ahead and built up to the 5-5-3 ratio as set out in the Washington treaty. [Applause.]

Italy has declared in the last few days that she is not even in sympathy with the limitation of armaments, and France has made it clear that she does not intend to enter into any agreement. The gentleman from Idaho said "we were slapping the President in the face" by voting for this amendment. I want to say to you, Members of Congress from every district in the United States, that we are charged with the responsibility under the Constitution of the United States to maintain an adequate national defense. [Applause.]

This is your responsibility as well as the responsibility of the Chief Executive of the United States.

There is no argument to the fact that the United States is behind in its building of cruisers of the class of 10,000 tons or under. Great Britain has built or building or appropriated for 54 ships of this class; Japan has 28 of such ships; we have only 15, and if we provide for the 3 new cruisers by adopting this amendment we still have but 18, and in view of the fact that no steps are being taken to replace those ships which, year after year, are becoming obsolete, it is time we are taking steps to remedy this situation.

I am inserting herewith a table which shows the relative strength of our cruisers of first and second line and also those of Great Britain:

Cruisers

Name	Tonnage	Date of completion
Rochester.....	8,150	1893
Pittsburgh.....	13,680	1905
Huntington.....	13,680	1905
Pueblo.....	13,680	1905
Frederick.....	13,680	1905
Huron.....	13,680	1908
Seattle.....	14,500	1906
Charlotte.....	14,500	1908
Missoula.....	14,500	1908
St. Louis.....	9,700	1906
Charleston.....	9,700	1905
Total.....	139,450	

It will be noted that these ships are from 18 to 33 years old. They are as a rule totally unfit for service, although three of them are now operating with special duties at reduced speeds. No one of them is in any sense a match for a modern cruiser. Their guns are old and of comparatively short range. They have obsolete fire-control systems. They are not fitted to carry aircraft. They can not overtake and bring to action any of the cruisers built by foreign powers in recent years because they are too slow. It is not too much to say that a single modern cruiser, carrying 8-inch guns, could defeat the whole of these cruisers, if she could carry enough ammunition, because the modern cruiser can lie outside the range of the guns of any one of these vessels and still have them within effective range of her own guns. None of these cruisers is an effective reply to even the smaller cruisers built in recent years by foreign powers, because they can not bring those cruisers to action.

The life of the cruiser has been estimated at 15 years. These cruisers can not be estimated otherwise than zero fighting value when judged in comparison with the modern cruiser.

United States light cruisers, first line

Name	Tonnage	Date of completion
Cincinnati.....	7,500	1923
Concord.....	7,500	1923
Detroit.....	7,500	1923
Marblehead.....	7,500	1924
Memphis.....	7,500	1924
Milwaukee.....	7,500	1923
Omaha.....	7,500	1923
Raleigh.....	7,500	1924
Richmond.....	7,500	1923
Trenton.....	7,500	1924
Total.....	75,000	

These cruisers are the only modern cruisers possessed by the United States Navy. They are armed with 6-inch guns and are the equal of any cruisers in the world carrying guns no heavier than 6-inch.

United States light cruisers, second line

Name	Tonnage	Date of completion
Chester.....	3,750	1908
Birmingham.....	3,750	1908
Salem.....	3,750	1908
Olympia.....	5,865	1895
Denver.....	3,200	1904
Des Moines.....	3,200	1904
Chattanooga.....	3,200	1904
Galveston.....	3,200	1905
Cleveland.....	3,200	1903
New Orleans.....	3,430	1898
Albany.....	3,430	1900
Total.....	39,975	

It will be noted that these ships are from 18 to 28 years old. Because of their age, slow speed, lack of ability to carry aircraft, obsolete fire control, short range of guns, and general obsolescence, they are of practically no fighting value, judged by modern standards. No one of them has speed enough to bring to action any cruiser built by foreign powers in recent years. They are purely police vessels for peace-time use and, as such, have practically passed the limit when they can be profitably employed for this purpose. We are compelled, by the absence of other available vessels, to keep some of them in commission.

British light cruisers, first line

Name	Tonnage	Date of completion
Hawkins.....	9,750	1919
Frobisher.....	9,750	1924
Effingham.....	9,750	1925
Vindictive.....	9,750	1918
Emerald.....	7,550	1925
Enterprise.....	7,550	1926
Despatch.....	4,765	1922
Diomedea.....	4,765	1922
Durban.....	4,650	1921
Dunedin.....	4,650	1919
Dragon.....	4,650	1918
Delhi.....	4,650	1919
Dauntless.....	4,650	1918
Danae.....	4,650	1918
Curacao.....	4,190	1918
Coventry.....	4,190	1918
Colombo.....	4,190	1919
Cairo.....	4,190	1919
Carlisle.....	4,190	1918
Capetown.....	4,190	1922
Total.....	116,670	
Calcutta.....	4,190	1919
Curlew.....	4,190	1917
Ceres.....	4,190	1917
Cardiff.....	4,190	1917
Caradoc.....	4,120	1917
Calypso.....	4,120	1917
Caledon.....	4,120	1917
Conquest.....	3,750	1915
Constance.....	3,750	1916
Concord.....	3,750	1916
Comus.....	3,750	1915
Cleopatra.....	3,750	1915
Champion.....	3,750	1915
Centaur.....	3,750	1915
Castor.....	3,750	1915
Carysfort.....	3,750	1915
Canterbury.....	3,750	1916
Cambrian.....	3,750	1916
Calliope.....	3,750	1915
Aurora.....	3,500	1914
Total.....	77,620	

It will be noted that the oldest one of these cruisers was completed after the most modern of our cruisers and light cruisers of the second line. They are all of them faster than any of our cruisers or light cruisers of the second line. Our 10 Omahas are the only vessels in our Navy which are equal to or superior to them in speed or modern equipment.

British light cruisers, second line

Name	Tonnage	Date of completion
Adelaide.....	5,500	1922
Birmingham.....	5,440	1914
Brisbane.....	5,400	1916
Dartmouth.....	5,450	1911
Melbourne.....	5,400	1913
Loestoff.....	5,440	1914
Sydney.....	5,400	1913
Weymouth.....	5,250	1911
Yarmouth.....	5,250	1912
Total.....	48,530	

These vessels, while of later date than the United States cruisers of the first line and light cruisers of the second line, are not considered as effective fleet units, due to age and probable reduced speed.

In so far as the need of the Navy for cruisers is concerned, attention is invited to the fact that at the present moment in time of profound peace, six of the eight available modern cruisers are now diverted from their normal training and fleet operating duties to special duties connected with two disturbed areas in which the United States is interested—Nicaragua and China—and that a seventh cruiser now undergoing overhaul is about to proceed to the Caribbean. Of the three remaining cruisers, two are flagships of destroyer squadrons, and one is flagship of the Vice Admiral in European waters. In other words, in time of profound peace, we have barely enough cruisers to meet the day-to-day requirements for the protection of our citizens and our interests in foreign waters. It needs no stretch of the imagination to see how vastly the demand for this kind of service would increase in time of war, and that superimposed on these demands would be the demands of the fleet itself.

I hope the gentlemen of this House, in their loyalty for their Government, will vote for this amendment, and as long as I am a Member of this honorable body and as long as I can raise my voice and as long as I have the grave memories of war fresh upon my mind and soul, so long as I can remember my buddies being shot down upon the battle fields, as long as I can remember the mothers, whose boys never came back, as long as I remember the disabled and maimed veterans who have sacrificed their future health and happiness, and as long as I can remember the blood that was sacrificed by the soldiers who fought in the Spanish-American War and the Civil War I will vote and use all the influence for an adequate national defense which will insure us against another disastrous conflict and sacrifice of lives.

It is our duty now to live for peace, pray to the Almighty God every day for continued peace. To educate our future generation for peace, but in the meantime, protect ourselves, or, rather, insure ourselves against a future war. I will gladly sacrifice my life here, now, or any time in the future if by doing so I could maintain everlasting and permanent peace throughout the whole world. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have a very restricted issue, in spite of the much that may be said about it. Some time ago a lawyer appearing before the Supreme Court of the United States to discuss a relatively very unimportant question, said that he would first state the facts and then state the law, and then he would make a lunge at the passions of the court. I think my friend from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], whom I so much admire, and others have become unduly vehement in lunging at the passions of the House in respect to this matter. There is not any important construction of cruisers involved. Mark that. There are endless words used, but there is no immediate construction of cruisers at stake. All that the Senate proposes and all that those who are approving the Senate's position are now suggesting, is not that any large percentage of about \$50,000,000 shall be appropriated to construct these cruisers, but that an extremely small percentage of that amount (\$450,000) shall be appropriated, for what? To do nothing practically. The gentlemen who are so insistent, if they are really concerned about the Navy, logically ought to propose something more important and substantial than just a little bit of an appropriation which will get them nowhere. That is hardly understandable. On the other hand, the case has an important psychological aspect. The President says, and I say—and I like to stand by the administration when I can do it—"Wait with me a while; let me try out the experiment, upon which I have entered upon your advice, and determine whether we can make an arrangement at Geneva with the nations looking to a further limitation of armament."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have not the time.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to correct the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I am very fond of my friend, but I can not yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman's statement is in error concerning the pending amendment and I want to correct him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The President says, "Wait and give me a chance; you told me to do this thing, and now you should afford me an opportunity to try to do it; you are not losing anything because you are not proposing now to actually construct, you are only proposing to make a gesture toward construction." Are we going to do it or are we not going to do it? If we go ahead now, in spite of the President's advice, we hamper and embarrass him, when he is taking the very course which we have urged him to take. There is no long delay to be apprehended. Congress reconvenes on the 1st of December next, and I say now as one who believes in an adequate navy, that if it should then be found that the effort fails to secure an agreement in conference with the other powers, I will be prepared to vote any appropriation which may be necessary to insure our equality with the strongest naval nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Coyle].

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Speaker, in 1793 before the House and Senate, much disturbance was occasioned by the action of the Dey of Algiers. This potentate had laid tribute on all of the ships trading in the Mediterranean and had held in captivity,

at that time for eight years, one Capt. Richard O'Brien and one hundred or more seamen and officers, citizens of the new Republic.

This Dey of Algiers had concluded treaties with most of the European nations and very frankly stated to our emissaries that he was unable to conclude a treaty with the United States, because, by so doing, he would remove the only remaining outlet for the energies of his corsairs. Congress began a debate on a resolution to build six fast-sailing men-of-war, the cruisers of that day, as they visualized them. Captain O'Brien had written:

By all means urge Congress to fit out some remarkably fast sailing ships, well appointed and manned.

In January this discussion began and through the month of February, according to the records of the debates in the House the argument was altogether one-sided. One speaker after another opposed the propriety of the measure. The debates in the Senate have not been preserved, but Madison in the House continued to reiterate that peace might be purchased for less money than this armament would cost. The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Clark, opined that a fleet, when once it had been begun, would have no end in time. His plan was to hire the Portuguese to carry our fight against the Dey, and Baldwin, of Georgia, unworthy predecessor of our own distinguished gentleman from Georgia, was of the opinion that "bribery, alone, could purchase security from the Algerines," and one "Doubting Thomas" from Virginia, a Mr. Nicholas, "feared that we were no match for the Algerines." From Maryland and from Pennsylvania came strong support for the resolution, and from Massachusetts, Mr. Fisher Ames taunted Madison and caused him to define his position.

Mr. Giles, of Virginia, sided against the President with the not altogether helpful suggestion that navies were very foolish and futile things. "That value," said he, "which is spread upon the waters in ships might much better be employed by land which needed development."

In the Congress of that day, in the House, Madison was the spokesman of the rising opposition to Washington led by Thomas Jefferson, and Madison in the House and Monroe in the Senate continued to voice that dissatisfaction with what they then termed the monarchical ideas of our first President.

In the debate it was disclosed that Madison's plan was to close the Nation's doors and require her citizens to stay at home. Is there any analogy here between the hermit attitude of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe and the to-day attitude of some of the vociferous broadcasters of this day. I can hear Madison say in the House: "If our people will trade, let them take care of themselves, and why should we worry if they are thrown into slavery by the Algerines and their property confiscated, for after all, it is their property not ours." And so to-day I hear it argued that American men who go exploring or investing in other countries of the world must defend their own rights in those countries and not involve this United States.

In a final attempt to defeat the bill, Giles, of Virginia, made a long and painstaking address. With a motion to recommit he alleged at great length that a navy is the most expensive of all means of defense. According to his warning the tyranny of governments lay in the expense involved in navies; that the Navy would oppress the individual States in the Union as the instrument of the President. The British, said he, are not yet destroyed, but their liberties have been banished by their navy. The monarchy in France had been ruined by its navy and we, were we to embark upon a national policy of naval defense, would be involved, said he, in war with all of Europe. Can these ships, said he, go marching on dry land and break the prisoner's chain? He pleaded against any move which would irritate the barbarians and cause them to inflict additional misery and punishment on their starved and naked American prisoner slaves. The longer he talked, the more his support fell away and finally at the conclusion of his speech the bill was passed 50 yeas to 39 nays. In the Senate the debate is not available, but there the vote was so close that the Vice President cast the deciding ballot, and in order to get this ballot the amendment had been added, that if peace terms could be arranged with the Dey of Algiers and his corsairs, then and in that event no further building could be had under this particular act.

In line therefore with that provision the following year, after many vicissitudes, a treaty of peace was concluded and around the council table the struggling colonies poor in dollars and in credit agreed to pay as the first cost of that peace treaty just under \$1,000,000. Also to pay 12,000 gold sequins annually as tribute to Algiers, and as a further humiliation to build, arm, and deliver a ship of war and supply the pirates with naval stores.

Fortunately, however, by chance, or by design, there was saved from this first disarmament conference three of the six ships authorized. The other three, by agreement with Algiers, being sunk or discontinued.

The work, however, continued on three fast-sailing ships, the battle cruisers of that day, the *Constitution*, the *United States*, and the *Constellation*.

In spite of the million of dollars, perhaps, because of this very money advanced and paid to the Algerines, as all the world knows, these three cruisers of another day were needed long before they were finished, and anyone who will trouble to see the motion picture, "Old Ironsides," can read the need and see the way it was met on the shores of Tripoli nearly 10 years later. Can any man say that the *Constitution*, the *Constellation*, or the *United States* caused the trouble with the Tripoli pirates or caused that other war for the freedom of the seas and the rights of American seamen? Rather, indeed, is it true that had they and their sister ships which died a burning, been a fleet in being and not a fleet on paper, the million of tribute, the thousands of rent, and the tears of many American homes might well have been saved.

In all of this conflict, with dissension in his Cabinet between his Secretary of the Treasury, his ardent supporter, and the Jefferson, Madison, Monroe opposition, the figure of Washington looms as one worried and torn by the conflict of his official family.

The arrival of Genet, with his credentials, from the new Republic in France and his propaganda that America should side with France in the newly declared war against Great Britain, the pressure from the people and from the Congress, with difficulties besetting him from all sides, it must have been in bitterness and in shame that he was forced to sign that treaty of peace with pirates and corsairs, because in the message transmitting the treaty to the Congress, wrung from his unwilling hand and written almost with his lifeblood, are his words—

to secure respect to a neutral flag requires a naval force, organized and ready to vindicate that flag from insult or aggression.

How well these words may guide and guard our actions and our honor in this a later day. Can we, who enjoy those rights for which they pledged their lives and sacred honor, can we do less than regard that admonition which comes down to us almost through the ages and realize that Washington visualized the Navy not as an instrument of battle but primarily as an instrument of peace.

As Washington must have prayed for a navy, must have fought for a navy, must have talked for a navy, let us see that to-day our Navy, as our first line of defense, is built not necessarily the biggest in the world but always and before all else as a tribute to his memory; let each of us, in Congress or out, so conduct himself that for all times in America there is assured a navy adequate to our needs, sufficient to keep the peace of the world, sufficient to command the respect of the world—not the biggest but the best navy afloat.

Mr. Speaker, in the few moments remaining I want to discuss particularly the dual need of cruisers, and I shall do this in the light of an experience which carried me through the Naval War College at Newport as some preparation for membership on the Naval Committee in this House. I refer to the peace-time need and the war-time need of cruisers, and more particularly America's need for cruisers, without reference to what any other nation is doing. There is a very distinct dual need for cruisers in our Navy, and there is not a sufficient number of cruisers to make our fleet a well-balanced one, either in peace time or war time. The cruiser in peace times is essentially the peace keeper. It has been my privilege on more than one occasion to be present on board a cruiser going into a foreign port where things were immensely upset and property and lives hardly safe.

The mere coming of an American improvised cruiser, if you please, has generally settled the difficulty with not only amity but with fairness. The real lack of cruisers sometimes in an urgent peace-time need has called perhaps for war. It is not ill-advised to say that cruisers in Habana harbor, instead of the battleship *Maine*, might have avoided the war with Spain, because it is possible that had we had a little group of cruisers available to go into Habana Harbor the war with Spain perhaps might not have happened. We were forced to use the wrong instrument, and we all know that that sometimes leads to difficulties.

The cruiser in war time is a scout. It does seem that 10 cruisers of 7,500 tons each is but an inadequate scouting force for a battle fleet composed of 20 battleships. However, as things may come out in the future, the provision for the rigid airship will undoubtedly help supply the war-time needs if

these cruisers are not supplied. But for my part, bear in mind that not only the cruiser does serve to avoid war, but also the cruiser in the event of war may and can serve as an adequate screen for a battle fleet. It seems to me you can hardly go amiss; truly, I can not see that you can go in direct opposition to the President if you do vote for this House amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 23 minutes, the gentleman from Georgia 19, and the gentleman from Idaho 41 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman from Idaho yield some time?

Mr. FRENCH. You are still ahead, but I will yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I can not support this appropriation for three extra cruisers at this time. I do not believe we are justified in making this increase in our naval strength in the light of world conditions. In my opinion we would not only be violating the spirit of our disarmament treaties but we would be inviting, if not provoking, the other great nations of the earth into a renewed race for naval supremacy, which would possibly threaten the peace as well as the financial stability of the world.

Some time ago Sir Auckland Geddes, the British ambassador to the United States, in a speech in this country, said that "an age is dying in Europe." What age did he refer to, Mr. Speaker? The age of Europe's greatness, according to that statement, is going down before the influences of destruction and decay. That death is being hastened as a result of the leaders of the Old World embracing the destructive doctrine that might makes right or, to use the words of Napoleon, that God is on the side of the heaviest artillery.

Cecil Roberts, one of the great men of the British Empire, said in a speech in Chicago something like a year ago that England's sun was going down, but it would be a glorious sunset.

And it will. No nation that has ever risen and fallen in all tides of time has contributed more to the advancement and happiness of mankind than has the British Isles. Mr. Roberts states that her sun is about to set and that the leadership of the world has been transferred to the United States.

With that leadership there comes a great moral responsibility. If we would lead the world, we must first prove ourselves worthy of world leadership. We can not add to our prestige as a world power for the moral and spiritual and economical advancement of this modern civilization by breaking the letter or the spirit of our disarmament treaties, and starting out upon a policy of naval and military armaments that will arouse the suspicion and forfeit the confidence of mankind.

I was a Member of the House in 1921 when we adopted the amendment providing for the calling of a disarmament conference, and I consider that the greatest day, from a standpoint of results, that I have ever seen in the Congress of the United States.

We had just emerged from the World War, which had left upon the battle fields of Europe the lifeless bodies of 10,000,000 men. In that contest we had told the American people and the world that we were fighting to repudiate for once and for all the deadly doctrine that might makes right. We had proclaimed from one end of the country to the other that we were fighting to destroy military autocracy. What is military autocracy? Ah, Mr. Speaker, there can be but one answer. It is overgrown naval and military establishments in times of peace, together with the spirit of aggression which they always inspire.

We passed that amendment by a vote of more than 50 to 1, and the conference was called to meet in Washington on November 12. It convened under the most auspicious circumstances that ever surrounded the convening of any conference on the face of this earth.

On the day before it convened there arrived in this Capital the most influential delegate that ever attended an international gathering—the lifeless body of the unknown soldier, one of those countless thousands whose names disappeared with their bodies as they went down in that great contest for the supremacy of the world. President Harding had to have an amplifier, radio service, telegraph, and telephone wires to make his voice heard throughout the country as he stood before that nameless bier and preached the doctrine of peace on earth and good will toward men, but this silent delegate of delegates needed no assistance to carry the voiceless eloquence of his silent protest against armament and militarism throughout the length and breadth of the earth. He was accompanied by the world's greatest interpreter, the sorrowing figure of a widowed war mother who had lost her husband and three stalwart sons in battle and who had come 3,000 miles to place a wreath upon his grave.

If there were those who could not understand the President's address, if there were those who could not appreciate this dead boy's silent appeal, or who did not realize the sacrifice he made, they could hardly fail to understand it when they looked upon the withered form of that heroic mother and caught the message of humanity's appeal translated into the terms of a mother's sacrifice and a mother's love.

He was given a great reception, such as no king, prince, or potentate had ever received or ever deserved. The procession down Pennsylvania Avenue surpassed all description, and the floral tributes coming from every quarter of the globe have possibly never been equaled in all the history of the world. In the rotunda of this Capitol yonder his remains lay in state while 100,000 people filed by. You could almost hear a prayer going up from every anguished soul to the effect that this might not occur again.

There seemed to well from the hearts of the people of the world an appeal to the best judgment and the best intelligence of the world to bring about a cessation of that mad race for armaments which was threatening to destroy the peace and bring about the bankruptcy of the world.

I witnessed the opening of that disarmament conference, and I must say that it was the most impressive spectacle that ever came under my observation. I was an invited guest, as the rest of you Members were. We had reserve seats at the greatest show on earth.

As I looked down upon that conference hall stirring with preparation and pulsing with the excitement of impending events I experienced a feeling of hope that we had at last come to a turning point for the betterment of mankind.

In front of me, seated around the conference table, were the chosen delegates of the leading nations of the earth, while back of them sat the foreign diplomats, heads of the various armies and navies, and other high ranking officials and visiting dignitaries without number. The galleries were packed with Senators, Congressmen, and other American officials. The stage was set for action, and action of the most far-reaching importance was not long delayed.

When the conference was finally opened and the head of the American delegation arose to outline our program, he thrilled the world with a program for a reduction of armaments, which if carried out would lift hundreds of millions of dollars in yearly taxes from the shoulders of the American people, as well as from those of every other country involved.

If there had ever been a doubt as to how the American Congress stood on this proposition at that time, or as to how the American people stood, it was certainly dispelled when that program was announced. With one spontaneous accord every Senator and Congressman present leaped to his feet, as did diplomats, generals, admirals, visitors, and spectators, and made that great auditorium ring and resound with an outburst of enthusiasm that will echo down the centuries.

The head of our delegation did not take time to argue the case. He did not need to argue. That had already been done by the silent delegate at Arlington, whose mute but thrilling message had touched the hearts and awakened the conscience of a war-torn civilization.

His appeal had been heard at last, and by it he had possibly ushered in a new day when war between civilized nations should cease, at least for years to come, when the great burden of taxation, which war and armaments entail, should be lifted from the masses of the world, when Christianity should take on new life and civilization be given a new birth.

It was the greatest moment, in my opinion, this world has seen for 2,000 years, and gave to the suffering peoples of the earth the first real encouragement they had had in the future stability and safety of our modern civilization.

In the treaties entered into at that conference limiting the size of the great navies of the world America's interests were amply guarded, not only by the leading statesmen of our times but by the ablest naval experts the world has yet produced. That conference put a stop to the mad race for naval supremacy and dispelled the suspicion that was then intensifying the international atmosphere. It removed the threat of war and placed the maintenance of peace within the power of those who were to preside over the destinies of the great nations of the earth in the years to come.

Not only that but one of the treaties growing out of this conference severed the treaty of alliance between Great Britain and Japan, which accomplishment, in my humble judgment, was worth more to the peace of the world than all the navies for which this Congress could appropriate in the next 100 years. [Applause.]

When that conference closed, Mr. Speaker, we found ourselves in possession of the moral leadership of the world, and if we turn backward now by repudiating either the letter or

the spirit of those solemn treaties, when it is least necessary and when even the President of the United States, who is on the side of a big Army and a big Navy, and who, through his Secretary of State, is waging war in a foreign country, the little Republic of Nicaragua, if we now attempt to out-Herod Herod and go beyond anything in the way of naval construction advocated by him and by those interests who are backing him, and whose lines of communication are always exposed, we will have turned backward and abandoned that great moral leadership which is worth more than all the navies and all the armies of the earth combined. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I want to see my country amply prepared, but she is better prepared to-day comparatively than she has ever been since the Government began, and she would be thrice armed—aye, infinitely more than thrice armed—if she could but resume and maintain her moral leadership among the nations of the earth. Let us not assume even the appearance of violating our solemn obligations, even if it should be conceded that we have the technical right to proceed with the construction of these extra cruisers. Let us not merely keep the word of promise to the ear while breaking it to the hopes of the war-weary nations of the earth that are looking to America to lead them onward and upward to a period of lasting peace, through common understanding, and into the enjoyment of a more wonderful and more glorious civilization. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how many minutes have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 19 minutes with the time he yields to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I voted on the 7th of January to sustain the President's view of this matter. I made a speech favoring the President's view at that time. I did what I did then in the utmost good faith, and I felt that I was doing the right thing at that time. I wanted to give the President an opportunity to try out with these various nations the question as to whether or not we could expect at any time in the near future any limitation of naval armaments.

Since that time the President has called upon the various nations concerned, and he has had a flat refusal from France, and also a flat refusal from Italy. Italy, of all nations on the earth, should have been the last to have given the President the answer she gave, in view of the very liberal treatment she received at our hands in the settlement of her debt to this country. But we are now confronted not with a theory but a condition. As I understand this debate and as I understand the question that concerns us now, it is whether or not we will arm the President of the United States with the authority, if he so sees fit, to build these cruisers, as he does not have to spend the money unless he wants to. I am in favor at this time of saying to the world that it is the sense not of the President of the United States but of this Congress that the United States of America is abundantly able, if necessary, to have a navy sufficient to take care of the situation. [Applause.] I believe in adequate defense, and I am in favor of the Senate amendment at this time because of a changed situation; and I for one am going to vote for the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. How much time does the gentleman yield back, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my colleague from California [Mr. LINEBERGER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this whole debate here to-day seems to have resolved itself into the question of what are our obligations to the country in the matter now before us. I take it that this is our primary interests as individuals without exception. When the Limitation of Armaments Conference was held here some five years ago we entered into an agreement with the other four great powers, who were participants with us in that conference, that the ratio should be 5-5-3 on battleships. Everyone knows, and it is not denied, that we were unable to include cruisers and other auxiliary craft, because the other powers were then as now uncompromisingly against the limitation of auxiliary naval craft, and it appeared that insistence on our part at the time would have wrecked the conference, which

many honest and pacific-minded people were disposed to herald as ushering in the millenium. In the light of what has transpired in the last five years—with the race for naval supremacy still going on unabated so far as all classes of auxiliary craft is concerned—I for one regret that we did not insist, so that they should have been forced to agree or else forced us to face the same disillusionment then which we are facing now. [Applause.]

I do not contend that those nations have broken the letter of the agreement then entered into as to the battleship ratios, but I do maintain that in materially increasing their armament in cruisers, submarines, and other auxiliary craft quite as essential to effective naval power as are battleships, they have further overthrown the naval ratio then established and have morally, at least, violated the very essence and spirit of the Washington agreement. If we have an obligation—and we have—to see that the letter of the 5-5-3 agreement entered into with the nations who were participants in that conference is observed as to battleships, we have an equal or even greater obligation to the American people to see that the agreement be morally maintained all along the line, including cruisers, submarines, and aircraft, and that our Navy is maintained second to none. No intelligent Member of this House will rise in his place and say that this is true to-day.

The gentlemen who are opposed to this proposition of the three cruisers at this time have offered no answer whatsoever to the issue raised by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] who has reminded us, by reading the old authorization bill, which clearly stipulates that the President, at his own discretion, is authorized to suspend construction of these cruisers in case he is successful in bringing about another limitation of armaments conference—wherein cruiser limitation is to be considered—and, of course, between now and the time such cruisers may be laid down or completed.

It is true that the distinguished gentlemen on the Subcommittee on Naval Affairs of the Appropriations Committee are opposing our position, but it is equally true that almost unanimously, with one sole exception, I believe, the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, composed of 21 members who represent a fair cross-section of the House, not only geographically but in a political sense as well, are in favor of the amendment. Are we who have given months of our time in long hearings and a studious and sincere consideration of this subject to be credited with some knowledge and intelligent opinion in this important matter? [Applause.]

I regret very much that the distinguished and beloved chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. BUTLER] who, in his generosity, has yielded all of his time to other Members of the House and to Members, like myself, who are on the Committee on Naval Affairs, has not taken the floor himself, but I assure the Members of the House that Mr. BUTLER—and no man in this House is more sincere in favoring the cause of peace—is heartily in favor of these three cruisers, and I hope he will yield himself enough time before this debate is over to at least tell the House that he is unequivocally in favor of this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. I imagine the House will know that all right. Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman had about one-half minute remaining.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, all I wish to add to what has been said for the Senate amendment is that I would be loath to handicap the President, and I would be most loath to do anything that would interfere with what he has in contemplation. But, as was said here in January, it is the duty of Congress to provide adequate defense for our Nation. What is adequate defense? A navy that will compare with and can compete with any combination that might be formed against us. I hope the Senate amendment will prevail for no other reason than that I believe it our duty to provide adequate defense for our Nation. We can not delegate to anyone the right to provide it, and so I hope the Senate amendment will prevail. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCLINTIC]. [Applause.]

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago in the South Atlantic six bombing planes, at an altitude of over 6,200 feet, made a perfect score at a target approximately the size of a cruiser. However, on account of one of the bombs failing to explode, the judges did not credit these fliers with six hits.

This record was so remarkable that the Assistant Secretary of the Navy congratulated these fliers upon their success. It is true that the target was stationary; yet officers in the Air Service who are qualified to speak on this subject made the statement that if the target had been a cruiser, and the same had been in motion, that at least 50 per cent of the bombs dropped would have found their mark. Thus it can be seen that bombing planes can be used effectively at a great height in the air; and, according to the testimony that has been given under oath, it would take at least 100,000 shots from anti-aircraft before a plane could be hit at this height.

If six planes at a height of more than a mile can make 50 per cent of hits on cruisers, it means that this number could be sunk in less than 60 minutes, thereby bringing a loss in money amounting to nearly a hundred million dollars; and this does not take into consideration the loss of life and other equipment.

When a comparison is made with certain major nations concerning the item of cruisers, it is true that the United States has not kept up its ratio—that is, the 5-5-3 as agreed upon in the disarmament conference. But should this Nation engage in a shipbuilding policy which would cost millions of dollars to be expended on a type of ship that is not needed at the present time? As a hypothetical case, let us assume that the 5-5-3 treaty allowed each nation to have a million muzzle-loading shotguns and that the United States had not manufactured the number to which it was entitled under this agreement. Would it be better for our country to expend money for this purpose or would it be better to utilize the same in the purchase of up-to-date equipment, and the kind that would make our country safe in case we should be so unfortunate as to engage in war with some other nation?

I make the statement, without fear of contradiction, that if we had a solid line of cruisers that would reach from Miami Beach, Fla., to Rockaway Beach, Me., that you could not steam a single one of them to the shores of a major nation without losing them, unless they were properly protected by submarines and aircraft. I also make the statement that there is not a single Member on this floor that can point out where we would use a cruiser more successfully than a submarine or destroyer in case we should have to go to war. Then, if my deductions are correct, why not use this fifty million for the construction of efficient submarines and bombing planes?

If it is thought that this Nation would ever engage in a policy of conquest, then there might be some argument for the construction of a lot of cruisers, but just as long as we are satisfied with the policy that was adopted after the World War, which is that this Nation seeks no new territories and is not willing to encroach upon the rights of other nations, then we can rest secure in the thought that with sufficient submarines, destroyers, and aircraft no nation on earth can bring thought of fear to the citizenship of the United States.

As far as cruisers are concerned, if they could be utilized in such a way as to make our Nation more efficient, then I would gladly vote for them; but under the circumstances I feel that it would be a foolish expenditure of money to waste forty-five or fifty million dollars on a type of ship that can not be used with any degree of success unless it is properly protected with aircraft and submarines. How much better it would be for this Nation if we had several hundred submarines, several thousand airships, a full complement of aircraft carriers, and a sufficient number of dirigibles to take care of any kind of a situation. With such equipment our defense, taking into consideration the number of other kind of ships that we have at the present time, would be adequate to care for the needs of this Nation.

I am in favor of keeping enough battleships and cruisers to be used in peace times, as, in my opinion, it will not be much longer until these types of ships will only be useful for diplomatic purposes. At the present time the United States has 282 destroyers, in comparison with Japan's 87, England's 172, and France's 37. Every destroyer is a small cruiser; they have the same speed as a cruiser; the guns are smaller, yet the efficiency of a destroyer is its ability to maneuver in such a fast way as to get in striking distance of the larger ships, thereby enabling it to launch a torpedo and sink the same. Seven destroyers are equal to one cruiser in tonnage. Mr. FRENCH made the statement on the floor a short time ago that four destroyers would be equal in efficiency to any one cruiser, which can be construed that four destroyers would be able to dart in and out and back and forth in such a way as to get in torpedo range of a cruiser, thereby either sinking it or putting it out of commission. Even if Mr. FRENCH's conclusion is too low, then certainly no one will deny that one out of seven destroyers would be able to get up close enough to a cruiser to launch a torpedo.

If my statements in this connection are true, then when you compare cruiser strength with destroyer strength, we have a

sufficient number of destroyers to equal 50 cruisers in tonnage. The destroyer is the wasp of the sea; the destroyer is the guard that protects cruisers and other types of fighting ships. When there is a battle formation steaming across the sea, the destroyers spread out in a line in front of all the other ships, and it is their function to get close enough to the enemy to launch one of those death-dealing torpedoes, thereby putting the ship out of commission or sinking the same. During the World War what was the most efficient type of vessel used by the United States? Was it the slow, cumbersome ships or was it these small vessels that were the most efficient from the standpoint of mobility and maneuverability?

There will be some who will advance the argument that we need these cruisers to protect our commerce. If that is true, I want some one to point out what service a cruiser can perform in time of war that can not be properly taken care of by a destroyer. If the other major nations of the world continue the construction of submarines and different kinds of aircraft and this country should become engaged in war with some major nation across the ocean there would not be any commerce that could be carried on within airplane-striking distance of the countries engaged in the war.

There are those who always advance the idea that wars will never cease, and I am in accord with that sentiment, for the reason there are a number of small nations whose boundary lines are across only an imaginary line; yet when you take into consideration that the majority of major nations are separated by wide areas of water, then one will conclude when it is known that no major nation on earth can land an army or bring its ships within striking distance of another major nation without losing the same, because of the fact a sufficient amount of aircraft can not be brought aboard an invading fleet to combat a land air force; that a nation would be foolish to engage in a war that it can not carry to a successful conclusion.

If I thought the building of three cruisers would make this Nation more efficient, I would not only vote for three but would advocate the construction of as many more as would be needed, but the way I view this entire situation is that the policy now advocated will cause a wasteful expenditure of money, as additional cruisers can not be used unless properly protected by other kinds of ships. Of course, we can use them nicely in times of peace, but my entire observation is based upon a war situation and what I want to do is to build up our lines of national defense in such a way that we will keep our Nation equipped with the kind of up-to-date machinery that will make it impossible for any country to ever have a thought of engaging us in war.

The entire question resolves itself down to one point, and that is, How shall this Nation expend its money in an efficient manner to give the citizens the kind of protection that will make them safe under any kind of condition? Should this money be expended for cruisers that can not possibly steam within striking distance of the shores of any major nation; or shall we build up the efficient branches of our arms of defense, such as aircraft, submarines, and dirigibles, so that every person in the country will know that no enemy will ever come within striking distance of our shores? [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I participated briefly in the debate when this subject was originally before the House. I then favored the three-cruiser project and I have seen no reason since to modify my views upon the subject. Indeed, I am strengthened in the views which I then expressed.

I am unable to understand how we can be divided upon a question of this sort at this particular time. Arguments are now made that this is not the time, wait for some other time, and that we need no ships.

Do we need them in the Caribbean Sea? Do we need them on the Pacific side of Nicaragua? Do we need them on the shores and within the harbors of China? When within the memory of any gentleman who confronts me have we made a more vigorous demonstration of our naval power than we have in the past month?

We are told that we have built hundreds of ships and they are now gone. Some have rusted; many have been consumed and spent their days. This is true. But I would rather have our ships rusted and gone than our cities destroyed and our lands invaded by foreign forces. [Applause.] I am happy to know that these ships were not utilized in naval engagements, yet I wish to have the satisfaction and consolation of knowing that they can be utilized when we need them to protect ourselves. [Applause.]

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] bottomed his entire argument, and swept this House a few weeks

ago, when he based his argument almost wholly upon an impending conference for the limitation of armament. To-day the gentleman has made no mention of the position he then took. In the former debate I asked where was the evidence of an impending conference, on the land, on the seas, in the skies? Where? Suddenly our President, for whom I entertain the most profound respect, sounded the nations interested, and what was their answer? A broad, comprehensive negative.

Italy will not go. France will not go. Japan's acceptance is so qualified as to mean nothing. England realizes it is not America with which she must make her arrangements, but that she must make them with respect to her obligations and her defensive position in relation to continental Europe and other powers in the world beside ourselves.

Can we be led to-day to believe we are entering upon a great naval program by merely giving the President the power and the money to build or not, as he may see fit, three cruisers. Is this embarking upon a great naval program? The negative answer is obvious.

I maintain we are to-day the most isolated Nation in the world. I call this again to the attention of the House and I do it most regretfully. We have entered, rightfully or wrongfully, upon no international organization or contrivance for the promotion or maintenance of peace. We have rigidly declined. We are left to ourselves and by ourselves we will stand or fall.

In addition, we to-day have the open and in every instance the jealousy, enmity, and ill will of the great and powerful nations. Where have we to-day a friend left in the world? I would not have this House to understand I criticize anybody for the condition, but I reiterate that this is a fact and an uncontrovertible fact. [Applause.] If that be true, then why have we not the privilege to make some assurance to our people that we have the right to complete the three cruisers without throwing any obstructions into the peace movement of the world. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho has 26 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRENCH. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a most unequal fight. It is the organized against the unorganized. The employees in every navy yard in the United States want to keep on the pay roll of the Government, and do not want to be laid off, and they are therefore in favor of building new cruisers, and building anything and everything else new, so long as they hold their jobs. And they are organized, and have their representatives in the gallery.

The officers of the Navy are always exceedingly anxious to spend Government money, and to spend as much of it as possible, hence they are always clamoring for new battleships and new cruisers, and new this and new that, so that they may handle large sums, and so they may have enough new boats so that each officer will be in command of something. And they are organized. And they have their representatives in the gallery.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC], who is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and who is now finishing his twelfth year of service in this House, and who ought to be familiar with the situation, says that he is the only member on that committee who is not interested one way or another with navy yards or institutions. If he is correct, then there is a special interest in Navy building and Navy enlargements that such brother members of his on said committee have in big Navy programs, and they are organized and working together.

As I approached the House to-day the first man I saw at the lobby door was the affable representative of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation, the one who gave all the Members of Congress such a fine excursion on a special train of Pullmans to Philadelphia and Camden, when the U. S. S. *Washington* was launched, and entertained so royally on that trip. And the representatives of other shipping interests are here. And they are organized. And they have much influence. And they are bully, good fellows personally. And they are hard to get by. And their arguments are most convincing. And they are insistent. And they never give up.

And then we have the politicians organized, with political advantage forming the controlling prize.

And all of these interests which I have enumerated are organized here together to put this thing over. And against them

all are the unorganized trusting constituents of ours back home, unconscious of what is to befall them.

FORMER VICTORY IS TO BE TURNED INTO DEFEAT

On this question the unorganized people won a phenomenal victory on January 7, 1927. With the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives [Mr. LONGWORTH], the distinguished majority floor leader from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], the distinguished assistant leader from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], the distinguished whip of the majority [Mr. VESTAL], and our distinguished minority leader from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] all lined up together for the big Navy program, yet the vote on the TILSON proposition was defeated by 135 for with 137 against. And when it was again presented in the House that day, on motion to recommit, said bunch of organized, seasoned politicians were again routed by the vote of 161 for their big Navy program and 183 against building said three new \$50,000,000 cruisers.

UNINFORMED ABSENTEES

There were 88 Members absent that day, who did not hear the debate. They did not hear the masterful argument of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. They did not hear the unanswerable argument of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. They did not get the issue displayed that day on the floor from its every angle. And these 88 absentees are to cast the deciding votes to-day, or such of them as may be in Washington when the bell rings for the record vote on this question.

And they have been besieged with propaganda almost daily since that vote on January 7, 1927. All of these organized interests seeking to put this thing over have left no stone unturned to reverse the former decision of the House.

PRESIDENT CRITICIZED AS WANTING WAR

Almost daily some Member of this body, or of the other body at the other end of the Capitol, has criticized the President and charged him with trying to involve us in war. And now leading Republicans here in his own party are criticizing him for trying to bring about peace. This is one time when every American—Democrat, Republican, Socialist, and all—should stand behind the President of the United States in his effort to bring about conditions that will tend toward world peace.

Mr. Speaker, in this particular instance the President of the United States is pursuing a policy for world peace. I know very little about naval affairs, but I do know something about human nature and something about politics, and I believe I know the American people well enough to know that in this instance the test back home among your constituents ultimately when the reckoning time comes is going to be, "Did you Republicans stand behind the President of the United States in his present policy for world peace?" That is the important question that your constituents back home are going to ask you. I believe they are going to measure you up when you get back along that line. I believe the Democrats of this Nation back home, my Democratic constituents and yours, will apply the same yardstick to us, because this question is one of Americanism and not one of party politics. I believe when I go home my Democratic constituents are going to ask me, Did you stand behind the President of the United States on his world peace policy? And, Republican though he is, when he is pursuing a policy for world peace Democrats are going to ask us that question. I am going to carry my answer back, "Yes; I stood behind him and did everything I could to support him." [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope that it will not take me five minutes to say all that I now wish to add to what I said on this floor on the 7th day of January, when this bill was before the House.

I yield to no man in my admiration for and loyalty to the President of the United States, and he has no stronger supporter in his efforts to stop the race for naval armament. If I thought that any vote of mine cast here would injure in the slightest degree the chance of success along that line I should not cast it. [Applause.]

But I can not feel that a vote the effect of which is to continue the life of the authorization for three cruisers that will lapse on the 30th of June next unless some action is taken could have any such effect. I can not see how anyone could possibly construe it in the light of a threat, a menace, an affront, or anything else that could in any way defeat or retard negotiations for the limitation of naval armament.

The point I tried to make when I spoke before—and I emphasize it now—is that the important thing is not the amount of money appropriated, but the continuation of the authorization for three cruisers. On the occasion referred to I cited the President's Budget message, the same message in which he

recommended that no appropriation be made for the cruisers. In the very next sentence following the recommendation that no appropriation be made, he recommended that the cruisers be reauthorized by legislation. Let us see just where a literal compliance with the recommendations of the Budget message would leave us.

We are now within a week of the close of this Congress. With the existing condition of the legislative calendar, there is no possibility that we shall be able through independent legislation to reauthorize these cruisers. The fact is, this is the only way in which the President's recommendations, taken as a whole, can be made effective; and in my judgment, the amount of the appropriation carried is of minor importance. The main point, and the only point of consequence, as I see it, is keeping alive the authorization for the three cruisers.

This is the reason why I shall support the amendment proposed here to the Senate amendment. Incidentally, for it is of no consequence now, it is the same amendment that I favored when the bill was before the House in January.

I wish to repeat what I said at the outset, that I would uphold the hands of the President in his efforts along the line of the limitation of naval armament, but I can not feel that our action on this occasion in extending the life of these three cruisers—doing, in fact, the very thing that is specifically asked for in the Budget message—will in any way weaken the hands of the President in any negotiations he may be able to enter upon.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Suppose you vote that way and force the President to veto the naval bill; what will happen?

Mr. TILSON. I think the gentleman can trust the President, as we all do, to perform his duty in the White House just as the President can trust us to perform our duties on the floor of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. I believe he will veto it and send it back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in his usual felicitous and eloquent way expressed this morning what I trust is the real spirit of America, namely, that she is not moved by any avaricious ambition, that she seeks no territorial aggrandizement, that she would infringe upon no nation's rights, that she would simply insist upon justice to herself while doing justice to all others. That I understood to be the idea, although not so well expressed perhaps as the gentleman himself phrased it.

Mr. Speaker, I like to think that that has always been the spirit of America. I like to hope and trust that it always will be the spirit of America. But, sir, was it not the spirit of America in 1914 as much as it is to-day? I am sure our feeling as a Nation was as unselfish and disinterested in that year when a prince of the house of Austria, whose name but few in America had ever heard, was shot down by an assassin over in a little nation of Europe, far inland; but the flame that started from that pistol shot set the world on fire, and we witnessed 2,000,000 men from this disinterested America sent across the seas to do battle, and 2,000,000 others under arms at home ready to go.

There have been during our national life just two great wars that were general in their scope among European nations, the Napoleonic wars and the recent world holocaust, and though separated as we were and are from Europe, trying to keep free from European entanglements, yet, despite the prayers of mothers and the efforts of statesmen, we found ourselves unable to keep out. Shall we be more hopeful of the future in view of history? My dear friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] spoke to us fluently of the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments held here a few years ago, and of the moral responsibility of America, and the danger of militarism. When in history has a navy manifested militarism? [Applause.] Never in all the history of the world! Militarism, that is, that spirit bent upon war, has come from armies, and I have never favored any large standing Army for these United States lest it might distort that spirit to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] referred, lest we become a militaristic nation. In the past republics have become so, but never through their navies.

It might be judged from remarks made by some gentlemen here to-day that by adopting the Senate amendment we would in some way violate the spirit of that limitation of armaments convention. Surely no person will assert that. I merely say that inferences might be drawn from some of the things that have been said. As a matter of fact, we have not kept pace with the building program of Great Britain, which, by all the terms of the treaty, we were entitled to do; nor shall we do so

by adopting this Senate amendment. We shall simply add a few where Great Britain, without hesitation, has built many. We violate no treaty.

I have learned some things recently that have caused me to wonder about that treaty, whether or not, after all, it was the blessing to the world and the blessing to us that we hoped at the time it might be. If I am correctly informed, it has been intimated through diplomatic channels that the Government of Great Britain do not believe that we have the right to elevate the guns that are now upon those battleships which we preserved out of the scrapping at the time; and so we are not able in that respect, in the matter of gun range, to bring ourselves up to what England reserved for herself under the terms of the treaty. Since we have nothing against England, why should England make diplomatic representations to us upon that subject? [Applause.] Furthermore, I understand that by reason of some technicality in the matter of tonnage, concerning which I do not profess to be an expert, growing out of displacement, Great Britain has gained an advantage of 25 per cent in the matter of tonnage over the United States. I am not reciting these things as indicating any feeling toward Great Britain or any fear of trouble with Great Britain, but why should it be an affront or an offense to Great Britain or to any nation if we ourselves choose to exercise our undisputed rights under that treaty and lay down the plans and specifications for these three cruisers, adding this comparatively small tonnage to the Navy of the United States?

I fail to see why any nation is entitled to take offense or why such action on our part ought to arouse in the breasts of any thinking people the slightest apprehension in respect to our intention, and I say that particularly in view of our unselfish history of 150 years.

Some gentlemen have suggested that it might impede negotiations looking to further limitation. I can not see how or why it should impede such negotiations.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, will he please state that before our committee these commissioners asked that a building program might be put behind them, so that they might have a better and stronger hope of possibly getting a reduction of these small ships. This is done at their request?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has stated it, and better than I could, because it occurred before his committee.

Of course, I respect both the personality and the office of the President of the United States. I seek no political quarrel with him upon this question. There is no element of partisanship involved in this matter, so far as I know, and certainly none so far as my own heart is concerned; but, my friends, if unfortunately, despite all of our prayers and all our wishes, an occasion arises in which again the battle flags of the Republic are unfurled and the youth of the land have to go forward, then, when there might have been salvation by reason of that Navy to which we are entitled under all of the agreements we have made, but for the lack of which our coasts are attacked and our cities bombarded and our sons slain, it will be no defense to say that it was against the judgment of the President of the United States to have such a Navy and that, therefore, we had followed his judgment instead of our own. It will then be no defense to say, "We followed the President." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker and you, my colleagues, I know that it is a rather unusual thing for a Speaker to take part in debate. I am glad that it appears that you do not seem to mind very much. [Applause.] But I would not do so unless I believed, deep in my heart, that this matter is a fundamental, basic one, and of vital importance to the security and future of my country.

I do not find it a grateful task to oppose an item of a bill brought in by the Subcommittee on Naval Affairs of the Committee on Appropriations. I think the work of my friend from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] since he has been chairman of that subcommittee has been extraordinarily useful and effective. [Applause.] I do not like to oppose an item that comes from the committee of which my friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is chairman, as I believe, the ablest chairman of the Committee on Appropriations certainly in my time. [Applause.] The only fault I have to find with that great committee is that in this instance it has adhered too faithfully to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. [Applause.] I am unable to perceive any strong reason why, in the case of the Army, that

committee should have gone beyond the Budget estimates and in the case of the Navy stood by them. I agree as to the efficiency of the Bureau of the Budget and I believe in following its recommendations whenever I can. But, mind you, the Bureau of the Budget is not responsible to the people of the United States, and we are. [Applause.] And particularly are we responsible in questions of national defense.

Now, I am not going into a discussion of the uses of the Navy either in war or peace. Of course we know that the navies of all countries are of very vital necessity to any country that has outside commerce in preserving and keeping open the paths of foreign trade.

I want to refer, though, to one instance in connection with the Navy of the United States that made a profound impression on me at the time. It was the year I was elected to Congress, in 1902. I happened to be here when the so-called Venezuela incident occurred. The Emperor of Germany had refused to arbitrate certain claims against Venezuela and had sent a fleet there to seize territory. While it was announced that the seizure was to be only temporary, it did not take a shrewd observer to know that had we not protested a naval base would have been established close to the Panama Canal. President Roosevelt sent for the German ambassador and informed him in no uncertain terms that if Germany refused to arbitrate those claims he would send the American fleet down there under Admiral Dewey, with orders to see that no Venezuelan territory should be seized, and facing that situation Germany immediately agreed to arbitrate. [Applause.]

I believe the American people, the great majority of them, certainly are for a powerful and adequate navy. [Applause.]

I know they supported Congress when it started out on the 1916 naval program, which, had it been allowed to be completed, would have made us by far the preponderating naval power of the world, and we would have been had it not been for the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament. We entered that conference potentially, at least, the greatest sea power of them all; we left it with a navy equivalent to the greatest of the naval powers of the world. The real reason why we were able to procure these agreements with other nations was that we were prepared to make and did make greater sacrifices than any two of them put together. [Applause.] It was hailed as a smashing victory for peace, but the American people expected, and had the right to expect, that all the terms of our contract were going to be lived up to. My distinguished colleague [Mr. BURTON] quoted with approval something Secretary Hughes said at that time. Let me read you what Secretary Hughes—who had more to do with the successful outcome of that conference than anyone—said a very few months afterwards. On the celebration of Navy Day he said:

The celebration of Navy Day has my hearty approval. This Government has taken the lead in securing the reduction of naval armament, but the Navy that we retain under the agreement should be maintained with efficient personnel and pride in the service. It is essential that we should maintain the relative naval strength of the United States. That, in my judgment, is the way to peace and security. It will be upon that basis that we would enter in future conferences or make agreements for limitation, and it would be folly to undermine our position.

[Applause.]

Thus spoke the Secretary of State at that time in contemplation of future conferences. I agree with every word of that statement. I said on the floor of the House the other day, and I now repeat, that while we were in honor bound under our treaty with the other nations participating not to go above the 5-5-3 ratio, yet we owed at least as great an obligation to the American people not to go below it. [Applause.]

To-day we are not in the position of superiority we were at the time the limitation of armaments conference was held; we are rather in a position of inferiority. Therefore we must take up the question of a new conference on the limitation of armaments not as a Nation willing to make great sacrifices in the cause of peace but as a Nation begging others to make sacrifices themselves. In answer to our invitation to enter upon another conference on the limitation of armaments we have within the last few days received refusals from two nations and a decidedly qualified acceptance from another.

Is this the time, my colleagues, to announce to the world that we are not going to appropriate anything for ships that sail the seas but simply authorize ships that live in dry docks made of blue prints? That seems to me to be at the foundation of this question.

That we may be secure at home and that our influence for good and for world peace may be felt abroad we must have a strong and adequate navy. [Applause.] Surely no other

country can complain if we carry out to the letter the contract we made with them. [Applause.] No nation can complain if we at all times insist on maintaining our Navy on a substantial equality with that of the other greatest naval power and in the proportion of 5 to 3 to any other?

We have been eminently just; we have been more than just to all the other nations of the world; let us be just with ourselves. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether there are any other speakers on the other side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Idaho has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. FRENCH. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to use that one minute?

Mr. BUTLER. No; I will yield it.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 14 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have had some hesitation in arising to speak here to-day, because of my recent illness, and I shall be very much pleased if I can have as much quiet as possible while I make what to me will be something of an effort.

No one loves the Navy more than I; no one wants to see it supreme in every way more than I; no one loves his flag more than I; and there is no man here or elsewhere under the flag who believes more in proper preparation for defense, but I do not consider it necessary to have an army or navy so large for necessary defense that they become a burden upon the people. [Applause.] If the Army and the Navy had their way the people of the United States would be called upon to pay not less than \$3,000,000,000 a year for their maintenance. [Applause.] I apprehend that if we should reach that stage of levying taxes we would soon find ourselves in the position of being antagonized by the people.

This is a simple question that is before us. It is a question of our integrity of purpose, whether when we indicated to our President that he should seek to have another disarmament conference we meant what we said. [Applause.] This was not a question of Republican or Democratic politics.

Democrats and Republicans alike have voted to request the President to call a conference for the further limitation of armament, and time and again we have suggested and intimated to the President that we would like to know when he was going to carry out our request; but the very moment he undertakes it we seek to hamstring him by telling him that he must lay down additional cruisers as a condition precedent, thereby serving notice on those with whom he is going to confer that he is not in earnest in behalf of a continued reduction of military and naval armament.

I am in earnest when I ask the President to do a certain thing, and every man here should be. [Applause.] For one I propose to stand by the President [applause] in his endeavor to perform the mission which we have asked him to undertake. He has shown his good faith by an effort on his part to obey our request. Shall we be spared the burdens necessarily imposed by naval competition? My friends, are we going to let it be said that our action in imposing a task upon the Chief Executive was merely a gesture?

If this amendment prevails, in what situation will the President find himself? Simply deserted, rebuffed in the midst of his negotiations by the sponsors of the moves he has made.

I have the greatest respect for the opinion of every Member here. Each one will vote his conscience. He will vote the way he believes he ought to vote in order to preserve the best defense that can be had for his Nation, and I propose to vote the way I intend to vote against this amendment inserted by the Senate because I believe that is not the way to treat the question.

You are not going to get the ships any sooner by the appropriation of this money. You will not be able to get the plans, because this appropriation does not provide for making plans, and the plans are made and paid for from another appropriation, over which we at present have no jurisdiction.

We have already authorized three cruisers to be built. We have appropriated money to begin their construction, but there are no contracts let, and yet you are proposing appropriations now for three more; but that will not get the cruisers sooner, because you have given the President the right to say he will not build these cruisers unless his judgment tells him it is the thing to do.

Then what is the purpose of the intended appropriation? Is it intended to prove to the people of the world that we are get-

ting ready to defend America's rights, or is it to prove to the people with whom we are proposing to confer that we are not in earnest in our efforts to confer? Is it for the purpose of showing the world that we are preparing for a greater measure of defense, or is it for the purpose of giving our enemies abroad the right to say we are not in earnest when we request the President to call such a conference?

Ah, gentlemen, you can not fool the intelligence of the world by the effort that is seemingly being made here to lay down three additional cruisers. You are not adding anything whatever to the strength of the Navy by what you are proposing to do, but you are embarrassing the President of the United States in his effort to gather the naval nations of the world together for the purpose of seeing what more can be done to stop competition in naval armament. [Applause.]

Now, what do we accomplish by the effort we are making here?

You are not going to get the cruisers. I want to say to you that we have tied up in the navy yards at Philadelphia and other places 103 destroyers, each one of which can be taken out on short notice, and each one of them has the speed of any cruiser that may be built. We have more destroyers than any other nation of the world, and the ownership of them places the United States in the strongest position of any nation of the world from a naval standpoint. [Applause.]

An appropriation of \$1,200,000 for the construction of three cruisers, the contracts for which have not yet been awarded, was made last year. Why? The answer is that you can not get private capital to finance a \$50,000,000 undertaking with but 2 per cent of the total cost available for the first year's work. If these three vessels which we are now discussing were let to private shipyards, those establishments simply would defer actual construction until such time as we would supplement the \$1,200,000.

What basis have we for believing that they would pursue that course? What basis have we to believe that they would pursue a different policy or course next year than the one they pursued last year and the year before? On the other hand, if it should be decided to build them in the navy yards, which I should think the President would feel compelled to do, with the scrapping possibility an ever-present factor in any treaty arrangement, the prospect of making any progress, if anything, would be less favorable, because the general law would prevent the yards from expending in excess of the sum appropriated.

You are simply going to do this if you adopt this amendment. You are going to enable the propagandists in foreign countries, who are opposed to any kind of military or naval limitations, to advertise that the American Congress has launched upon a cruiser-building program; that America is in no hurry for a conference; that America proposes first to build up her fleet before undertaking seriously to talk further limitations. That is the picture that will be painted, and that is the picture the President is asking you to suppress. If being apprised of the fact, you persist in this deceptive meaningless scheme; the responsibility is yours.

In the course of the debate on this proposition we have heard it said by those indorsing it that they are not impressed by the President's message, transmitting the Budget; that its meaning is not sufficiently clear, and, despite the President's position that it is for us to decide whether or not we are going to maintain an adequate navy.

Then, we have heard some contending that we would strengthen our position at the conference table if we would appropriate \$400,000 on account of each of three cruisers costing \$16,750,000 apiece. That is a fair sample of the silly chatter we hear which is expected to persuade men, presumed at least to have average intelligence, to vote for a proposition which is nothing more than a cheap bid for votes; that can have no possible immediate effect upon the standing of our Navy; that can in no wise change our original status; that can in no wise give relief of the shipbuilding industry, governmental or private; and that the President does not want, and has indicated as fully as circumstances permit would be a hindrance rather than a help.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I have one minute left, and I will yield it to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the one minute I want to say that we have under construction two airplane carriers, the cost of which will be close to \$100,000,000. England has not put out more than two submarines in the last eight years, Japan while proposing to renew four obsolete cruisers has postponed the construction of those cruisers by six years.

[Applause.] She reduced her appropriation for the navy just this year from 297,000,000 yen to 244,000,000 yen.

You are facing the question of whether you are going to act as statesmen. The hour has arrived when you are called upon to say by your votes whether you are in earnest when you ask the President of the United States to call a conference for the limitation of armament, and that vote in the affirmative will be against the appropriation that is proposed for this \$1,200,000 to lay down the construction of these three cruisers.

[Applause.] Mr. VESTAL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. VESTAL. I rise to offer an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. FRENCH. But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL], as I understand it, has offered a substitute, although I have not seen it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not recognized the gentleman from Indiana for that purpose, and the Chair is not sure that it would be in order. The gentleman from Georgia has moved the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. VESTAL) there were—ayes 240, noes 115.

So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VESTAL. Do I have the right now to offer my amendment?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. VESTAL. I did not think so. I felt that the Speaker had recognized me to offer the amendment as a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The Chair distinctly said, "For what purpose does the gentleman rise?" The Chair did not know that the gentleman desired to offer an amendment.

Mr. VESTAL. I answered by saying that I desired to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. But in the meantime the gentleman from Georgia was on his feet demanding the previous question. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 25, with an amendment.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 172, answered "present" 1, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—208

Abernethy	Carter, Calif.	Fenn	Johnson, S. Dak.
Aldrich	Celler	Fish	Johnson, Tex.
Allen	Chapman	Fisher	Johnson, Wash.
Andrew	Chindblom	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Kahn
Aswell	Cochran	Fort	Kelly
Auf der Heide	Collier	Free	Kendall
Bacharach	Connally, Tex.	Freeman	Kerr
Bachmann	Connerly	Frothingham	Ketcham
Bacon	Corning	Gallivan	Kiess
Bankhead	Cox	Gambrill	Kincheloe
Barkley	Coyle	Garner, Tex.	Kindred
Beedy	Crisp	Garrett, Tenn.	Kirk
Beers	Crumpacker	Garrett, Tex.	Lanham
Begg	Cullen	Gasque	Lankford
Bell	Curry	Glynn	Larsen
Black, N. Y.	Darrow	Green, Fla.	Lazaro
Bland	Davenport	Griffin	Lea, Calif.
Bloom	Davey	Hadley	Leatherwood
Boylan	Davis	Hale	Lehlbach
Brand, Ga.	Deal	Hall, N. Dak.	Lindsay
Briggs	Dempsey	Hare	Lineberger
Britten	Dickinson, Mo.	Harrison	Linthicum
Browning	Dickstein	Hawley	Lyon
Brumm	Houglass	Hayden	McDuffie
Buchanan	Drane	Hill, Ala.	McFadden
Bulwinkle	Drewry	Hill, Md.	McLeod
Burdick	Dyer	Hooper	McMillan
Butler	Eaton	Houston	McReynolds
Byrns	Edwards	Hudspeth	McSweeney
Campbell	Englebright	James	MacGregor
Canfield	Esterly	Jeffers	Magee, N. Y.
Carew	Evans	Johnson, Ill.	Magee, Pa.
Carpenter	Faust	Johnson, Ind.	Magrady

Major	Peery	Sosnowski	Valle
Mansfield	Perlman	Spearing	Vinson, Ga.
Martin, La.	Phillips	Stedman	Vinson, Ky.
Miller	Porter	Stevenson	Wainwright
Milligan	Pou	Strong, Pa.	Warren
Montague	Prall	Sullivan	Watson
Montgomery	Pratt	Summers, Wash.	Weller
Moore, Ky.	Quayle	Swartz	Weich, Calif.
Morgan	Rainey	Swing	Whitehead
Newton, Minn.	Reece	Taylor, N. J.	Wilson, La.
Newton, Mo.	Rogers	Taylor, W. Va.	Wingo
Norton	Rowbottom	Temple	Winter
O'Connell, N. Y.	Sanders, N. Y.	Thompson	Woodruff
O'Connell, R. I.	Sanders, Tex.	Tilson	Woodrum
O'Connor, N. Y.	Sandlin	Tydings	Woodyard
Oldfield	Sears, Fla.	Updike	Wright
Oliver, N. Y.	Smithwick	Upshaw	Wurzbach
Parker	Snell		Wyant
Parks	Somers, N. Y.		Yates

NAYS—172

Adkins	Eslick	Little	Sears, Nebr.
Allgood	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Lozier	Shallenberger
Almon	Fletcher	Luce	Shreve
Andresen	Foss	McClintic	Simmmons
Arentz	Frear	McKeown	Sinclair
Arnold	French	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinnott
Ayres	Fulmer	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Smith
Bailey	Funk	McSwain	Speaks
Babour	Furlow	Madden	Sprout, Ill.
Beck	Garber	Manlove	Sprout, Kans.
Berger	Gardner, Ind.	Mapes	Stalker
Black, Tex.	Gifford	Martin, Mass.	Steagall
Blanton	Goodwin	Menges	Strong, Kans.
Bowles	Green, Iowa	Michaelson	Summers, Tex.
Bowling	Greenwood	Michener	Swank
Bowman	Griest	Mooney	Taber
Box	Hall, Ind.	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Colo.
Brigham	Hammer	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Tenn.
Browne	Hardy	Morehead	Thatcher
Burtess	Hastings	Morrow	Thomas
Burton	Haugen	Murphy	Thurston
Busby	Hersey	Nelson, Me.	Tillman
Cannon	Hickey	Nelson, Mo.	Timberlake
Carrs	Hill, Wash.	Nelson, Wis.	Tolley
Carter, Okla.	Hoch	O'Connor, La.	Treadway
Chalmers	Hogg	Oliver, Ala.	Tucker
Christopherson	Holaday	Peavey	Underhill
Clague	Howard	Perkins	Vare
Cole	Huddleston	Purnell	Vestal
Collins	Hudson	Quin	Vincent, Mich.
Colton	Hull, Morton D.	Ramseyer	Voigt
Cooper, Ohio	Jacobstein	Rankin	Wason
Cooper, Wis.	Jones	Ransley	Watres
Cramton	Kearns	Rathbone	Wefald
Crosser	Keller	Reed, Ark.	Welsh, Pa.
Dallinger	Kiefner	Robinson	White, Kans.
Denison	Knutson	Romjue	White, Me.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kopp	Rouse	Whittington
Doughton	Kvale	Rutherford	Williams, Ill.
Dowell	LaGuardia	Sabath	Williams, Tex.
Driver	Lampert	Schafer	Wilson, Miss.
Elliott	Leavitt	Schneider	Wood
Ellis	Letts		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ragon

NOT VOTING—51

Ackerman	Gibson	Kunz	Scott
Anthony	Gilbert	Kurtz	Seger
Appleby	Golder	Lee, Ga.	Strother
Bixler	Goldsborough	Lowrey	Sweet
Boies	Gorman	Mead	Swoope
Brand, Ohio	Graham	Merritt	Tincher
Cleary	Hull, Tenn.	Mills	Tinkham
Connolly, Pa.	Hull, William E.	Morin	Walters
Crowther	Irwin	Patterson	Weaver
Dominick	Jenkins	Rayburn	Wheeler
Doyle	Johnson, Ky.	Reed, N. Y.	Wolverton
Fairchild	Kemp	Reid, Ill.	Zihlman
Fredericks	King	Robison, Ky.	

So the motion to recede and concur with an amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. Appleby (for) with Mr. Anthony (against).
Mr. Seger (for) with Mr. Jenkins (against).
Mr. Wolverton (for) with Mr. Sweet (against).
Mr. Merritt (for) with Mr. Ackerman (against).
Mr. Patterson (for) with Mr. Reid of Illinois (against).
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Ragon (against).
Mr. Mead (for) with Mr. Wheeler (against).
Mr. Weaver (for) with Mr. Lowrey (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Crowther with Mr. Rayburn.
Mr. Golder with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.
Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Morin with Mr. Gilbert.
Mr. Zihlman with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Goldsborough.
Mr. Brand of Ohio with Mr. Kemp.
Mr. Strother with Mr. Cleary.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CONNOLLY, and if present he would vote "aye," and I desire to withdraw my vote of "no."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not at the beginning of the roll call. I came in while they were calling the roll.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. BUTLER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS—NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those who have spoken upon this subject this afternoon have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there was a conference held here in the city of Washington in 1921 for the purposes of the reduction of armament. At that time we were admitted to have the greatest sea power of all the nations entering the conference. According to the terms reached at that conference, we scrapped splendid warships, while other parties to the conference only scrapped beautiful sets of blue prints. It was agreed that a ratio of 5-5-3 be allotted to Great Britain, the United States, and Japan. How has this matter worked out? It has worked out so that to-day, instead of being the equal of Great Britain at a ratio, we are not only below her but almost on a par with Japan. Who is responsible for this condition? With our Navy weakened and rapidly deteriorating, our only concern appears to be to keep within the requirements of the Director of the Budget, no matter what happens.

Members of Congress criticized the President for his action in Nicaragua. Yet events have proved that the President is right to-day in the stand he has taken. Things have come to such a bad pass in that country that only to-day we are advised that Great Britain is to send a warship to protect British lives and British interests in that country.

Without the proper naval representation we appear to be unable to do the work in Nicaragua that we should do. It is the duty of the Congress to commence at once the construction of the three light cruisers called for in the act of 1924, and to adopt a systematic program of construction that will restore to our country the commanding position we held prior to the Washington conference of 1921. Our Navy has always been our pride. We glory in its illustrious record. We pride ourselves upon its splendid achievements and the American people demand that we restore it to its former degree of strength and efficiency. Let us then do our part by voting to-day to agree to the Senate amendment and provide the initial appropriation for the commencement of the building of the three light cruisers, the completion of which will help restore American prestige on the high seas.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in some sections of this country there is a tendency to consider that men who have served in the Army or in the Navy of the United States in war have thereby become "militarists" and are always eager for more war and more armament. This, however, is not the case. No one hates war worse than those who have known war, and no one desires less armed conflict than those who have participated in it.

The policy of this country is peace. Armament in accordance with the policy of peace is absolutely necessary, and unless policy and armament go hand in hand we shall not be able to maintain the peace on which our civilization depends. I therefore am strongly in favor of the three cruisers now under consideration. I listened with the greatest interest to the remarks of the Speaker [Mr. LONGWORTH], and I agree absolutely with everything that he has said on the subject of maintaining our Navy in an adequate condition. I was in favor of the work of the disarmament conference, but to me the 5-5-3 ratio meant actual relative strength.

I desire to take this occasion to refer to another matter of interest to the American people. I recently introduced a bill for the modification of the Volstead Act along States' rights lines, and I feel sure that the following editorial in the New York World of December 22, 1926, will furnish food for thought to all the membership of this House. This editorial is as follows:

HOIST WITH THEIR OWN PETARD

Nothing could be more simple or moderate than the plan of Representative JOHN PHILIP HILL, of Maryland, to modify the Volstead Act as suggested by the New York referendum.

Section 29 of the Volstead law now reads:

"The penalties provided in this act against the manufacture of liquor without a permit shall not apply to a person for manufacturing non-intoxicating cider and fruit juices exclusively for use in his home."

Mr. HILL would amend merely by making it read that the penalties of the act shall not apply to the manufacture, sale, and transportation of beverages not intoxicating in fact, as determined by State law.

That phrase, "not intoxicating in fact," has already been judicially established as the meaning of "nonintoxicating" as used in section 29. It was the outcome of the case personally brought to an issue by Mr. HILL himself. Not only did a United States district court give this meaning to section 29, but the United States circuit court of appeals affirmed it and the Department of Justice and the Prohibition Unit accepted and approved it. And this notwithstanding the fact that "Farmer" HILL's cider, which figured in the test case, was alcoholic by much more than one-half of 1 per cent, and his wines ran as high as from 8 to 12 per cent.

This section 29 was a crafty piece of work on the part of the Volstead enforcers of prohibition. They were bidding for the farmers' vote and undoubtedly intended substantially to exempt the farmers from the application of their impossible law in its lying definition of what is intoxicating. Like a chicken or a curse, that section is now in the way of coming back home to roost.

I desire also to call to the attention of the House another editorial, from the New York Telegram of December 22, 1926, which I know will be of great interest, and which is as follows:

MR. HILL LAYS A GHOST

Very rarely has any one so clear a cause for getting angry at anybody else as the dries have in the case of Congressman JOHN PHILIP HILL of Maryland. Major HILL has been referred to occasionally as one of the congressional lame ducks; the appellation is not exact, for had he not chosen to contest the Republican senatorial nomination with WELLER those nonpartisan anti-Volsteaders of his district would have continued rolling up their 10,000 majority for him from now till the triumph of Captain Stayton or doomsday. But, lame duck or no, Major HILL has performed for the country a service which the ardent dries could ill see performed.

It is not just that he has introduced in the House a bill to amend the Volstead Act in conformity with the terms of the referendum which swept New York by such a majority last month; it is the particular point of the Volstead Act at which he proposed to insert the amendment that gets Mr. Wheeler's goat.

He makes choice of that particular paragraph which states that cider may be made almost ad libitum, provided only that it be not fermented to the point where it becomes intoxicating in fact; which states, also, that nobody need concern himself for fear his fruit juice is getting enough kick in it to be enjoyable. One can not read the amendment—and it is an amendment that should command wide reading—without ocular proof that if it be unconstitutional to permit the making of 2.75 per cent beverages, then the Volstead Act is unconstitutional.

That bugaboo is definitely dispelled. The dries may still affirm, until the courts have passed upon the question, that the States or a jury can not legally be allowed to say what is intoxicating and what non-intoxicating. But that part of the amendment which simply extends to all classes the privilege now enjoyed in full by farmers and their families, and which is duly advertised as such, can not easily be quashed by the old familiar unconstitutionality *hocus pocus*.

It has always seemed as if Major HILL's laboratory efforts in the making of peach liqueur strong enough to induce the enforcement bureau to try to stop him, and the success he had in bringing forth a court opinion that Congress had never intended to limit the strength of the farmer's beverage after the manner of the city dweller's beer, should have received more notice than has been given them.

They afford a substantial contribution to a political question which the Anti-Saloon League and its followers would never debate on its merits. Major HILL has now cashed in on them in a most practical manner.

The question of prohibition means a great deal more than the mere question of restriction of personal rights by the Federal Government in its sumptuary matters. It means an invasion of local self-government, and a departure from the old theory of the Constitution. For that reason the questions relating to prohibition remain of extraordinary interest to the American people. Even on such questions as national defense, most careful and valuable speeches may be made in this House without exciting any public interest, but every newspaper in the country publishes the slightest remarks made here in reference to Volsteadism. They publish these things because people are interested in it. The situation in the House has changed very vitally on this prohibition question in the past six years. A remedy for the evils of Volsteadism will be found in the not distant future. I should like

the House to consider the following House concurrent resolution, which I introduced on May 25, 1926.

Concurrent resolution

Whereas it appearing that the proposition to submit the vexed question of prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, as provided in the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and in the prohibition enforcement act, to the people for further consideration and settlement, as authorized by the State of New York and as proposed elsewhere, is finding favor throughout the country, evidenced by the expressions of leading citizens and officials, regardless of their former attitude on the question; and

Whereas a fair and legal determination of the question may only be ascertained by and through the election methods provided by the several States of the Union; and

Whereas it is needful for the peace and contentment of the people that this question be removed from the realm of controversy and from American politics, in which it is now overshadowing all else, to the great detriment of the right solution of economic and other problems: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the people in the respective States of which they are citizens should be accorded early opportunity to express, by ballot, their true sentiment upon the question now disturbing the tranquillity of the Republic, namely—

First. Shall there be a modification of the so-called Volstead Act, and if so, to what extent?

Second. Shall the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution be modified or repealed?

And to this end the President of the United States is requested respectfully to invite the constituted authorities of the several States to provide, as uniformly as may be, for the submission of this question to the sovereign electors of their respective States for their decision at the earliest practicable date.

SALE OF SURPLUS WAR DEPARTMENT PROPERTY

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate bill 4305, to insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4305) to authorize the sale under the provisions of the act of March 12, 1926 (Public, No. 45), of surplus War Department real property.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will report the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JAMES, Mr. HILL of Maryland, and Mr. MCSWAIN.

NATIONAL ARBORETUM

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 1640, to insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1640) entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a national arboretum, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to further insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will announce the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. PURNELL, and Mr. ASWELL.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the District of Columbia bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that the hearings on this bill disclosed that there will be an approximate increase of upwards of 1,500 pupils in attendance in the District schools in the next fiscal year; notwithstanding that there were on February 1, 1927, 49 schools in the District shamefully overcrowded; notwithstanding the fact that there are upwards of 3,000 pupils now compelled to attend part-time classes, the subcommittee in charge of this bill in the House has made no provision whatever for additional teachers. This is an alarming and dangerous situation and naturally provokes the inquiry—

How such a serious condition of affairs should be so flippantly disregarded?

Though it may be too late to have the omission corrected in the pending bill, I am anxious that the RECORD shall plainly show the fallacies upon which this unfortunate determination of the matter rested.

FALLACY NO. 1.—THAT THE AVERAGE OF PUPILS PER TEACHER IN THE DISTRICT SCHOOLS IS ONLY 23.4

This is part of a widely circulated propaganda obviously intended to strike at the head of the public schools.

It has no foundation in fact.

The actual average of pupils per teacher is nearly 31.

The testimony of the head of the Department of Education seems to have been entirely disregarded, while the testimony of outsiders, having no experience or knowledge of the subject, was swallowed with apparent eagerness.

For instance, a person representing herself to be the "legislative chairman of the District Congress of Parent-Teachers Association" presented to the committee an elaborate document purporting to give "administrative costs of public schools in cities of over 100,000 in 1924." This was interspersed with fabulous tables and running comment quite palpably intended to make out the worst possible case against the District officials. I will print herewith one of these "fabulous tables" taken from page 775 of the hearings.

WARNING—READ THIS TABLE WITH CAUTION

And note that in order to disparage the schools of the District and make it appear that there are less pupils to a teacher in the District schools than there actually are this artfully contrived table deliberately omits an entire column of figures, to wit, the figures showing the "actual daily enrollment," which are absolutely necessary in order to arrive at an honest result, and substitutes in its place a column of figures showing the "average daily attendance."

EXHIBIT A

(Mrs. Bannerman's statement)

Number of pupils per teacher in Washington for past 11 years

Year	Total enrollment	Average daily attendance	Percentage in average daily attendance	Number of teachers	Pupils per teacher
1916	59,526	49,625	83.3	1,787	27.77
1917	60,284	49,494	82.1	1,831	27.31
1918	61,536	47,838.6	77.74	1,855	25.78
1919	62,239	49,080	78.85	1,965	24.97
1920	65,298	52,738.5	80.76	2,096	25.16
1921	67,064	55,295.4	82.45	2,198	25.15
1922	69,541	58,261.8	83.78	2,224	26.19
1923	71,503	58,771.4	82.119	2,329	25.23
1924	72,573	60,034.6	82.72	2,496	24.05
1925	72,967	61,313.1	84.02	2,587	23.7
1926	74,903	61,778.5	82.47	2,640	23.4
1927		62,243		2,690	25.01

¹ Estimated.

Note also that this table uses the total number of teachers in the system, irrespective of whether they have classrooms or not.

As an actual fact, there were at the time of the committee hearings not 2,640 teachers in charge of classrooms, but only 2,278.

Yet the above misleading table counts in all the special teachers who have no allotted classrooms, and in this manner arriving at 2,640, divides that into the average daily attendance, which, for the year 1926, was 61,778.5. Answer, 23.4—obviously wrong!

The actual enrollment as of December 3, 1926, was 70,553, and this is the number of pupils "actually belonging" to the schools and for whom seats and classrooms and teachers must be provided.

Therefore, using 70,553 as the dividend and 2,278—the number of classroom teachers in contradiction to music, drawing, domestic science, and other special teachers—as the divisor, we get 30.97 as the average number of pupils per teacher, or practically 31 to the class.

When this figure is taken in comparison with other schools in the country the District schools come out pretty near the head of the list instead of at the foot.

FALLACY NO. 2.—THAT THERE IS NO CALL FOR ADDITIONAL TEACHERS

The confusing element in the problem happens to be this: That the school authorities had only appointed 2,630 teachers, including special teachers, up to November 1, 1926, whereas

the appropriation for the current year ending on June 30, 1927, provided for 2,666.

In other words, the superintendent had not wantonly wasted public money by appointing all the teachers the appropriation permitted. He came in for some criticism for this, but was he not entitled to praise instead? Is it not wise to hold back some of these appointments to man the schools gradually approaching completion?

This is precisely what he appears to have done, as appears from the following letter in answer to my inquiry as to what he had done about the 36 vacancies and what were the requirements necessitated by the opening of new schools now in process of completion and to be opened in the current fiscal year—that is, before June 30, 1926—and in the next fiscal year.

If I interpret the situation and needs of the school system correctly, 34 of the vacancies existing on November 1, 1926, have been filled and absorbed in the schools now open. Eleven additional teachers will be required in the schools to be opened before the close of the present fiscal year, and 52 teachers will be needed in the new schools to be opened in the next fiscal year. In other words, the system evidently needs at least 63 additional teachers for the next fiscal year.

However, the letter speaks for itself, and I herewith insert it, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 21, 1927.

HON. ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN GRIFFIN: Complying with your request, I herewith send you a summary statement showing the situation with respect to the teaching staff of the Board of Education and the changes therein since November 1, 1926, the period referred to on page 561 of the hearings:

Number of teachers Nov. 1, 1926	2,630
(Number of vacancies, 36)	
New teachers appointed in November	5
New teachers appointed in December	0
New teachers appointed in January	0
New teachers appointed in February	17

Total appointed since Nov. 1, 1926

22

Total number of teachers now on roll

2,652

How additional teachers have been allotted, showing schools to which allotted:

During the month of November the following teachers were appointed:

Additional teacher of music for the junior high schools	1
Teacher, grade 1, Lovejoy School	1
Teacher, grade 2, Military Road School	1
Teacher, grade 1, Jones School	1
Teacher, grade 1, Deanwood School	1

During the month of February the following teachers were appointed:

Teachers, Francis Junior High School	2
Teacher, grade 7, Montgomery School	1
Teacher, grade 6, Montgomery School	1
Teacher, grade 8, Phillips School	1
Teacher, grade 2, Deanwood School	1
Teacher, grade 2, Jones School	1
Teachers for Stuart Junior High School	8
Teachers for Macfarland Junior High School	2

[NOTE.—It is to be understood that this schedule does not set forth all appointments made and shown in the board minutes, but covers only those appointments chargeable to the balance of salaries shown on November 1, 1926.]

New buildings opened since November 1, 1926:

Francis Junior High School, Twenty-fourth and N Streets NW. Classes partly organized, but not yet operating in the building itself.

Stuart Junior High School, Fourth and F Streets NE. Classes partly organized, but not yet operating in the building itself.

Randall addition, First and I Streets SW. Classes organized and operating in the building itself.

Macfarland addition, Iowa Avenue and Webster Street NW. Classes organized, but not yet operating in the building itself.

Increase in number of classes resulting from opening of said buildings:

	Teachers
Francis Junior High School, 2 classes	2
Stuart Junior High School, 2 classes	8
Randall addition, no classes	0
Macfarland addition, 2 classes	2

Total

12

[NOTE.—It is to be construed that the additional classes and additional teachers do not represent the entire number of classes, but offsets have been made for salaries released by the bringing over of grade-school pupils into the junior high school organization. The above statement indicates the additional salaries used as a result of opening those buildings.]

New buildings to be opened before June 30, 1927, and teacher requirements:

	Teachers
The shops and industrial activities of the Stuart Junior High School	8
Shop and drawing rooms of the Macfarland Junior High School addition	2
A supplementary teacher at the Columbia Junior High School	1
New first grade, Blow School	1
Francis Junior High School, language instruction	1

Total

13

New schools to be opened in next fiscal year, ending June 30, 1928, and teacher requirements:

	Teachers
Burroughs School addition, Eighteenth and Newton Streets NE	9
Amidon School addition, Sixth and F Streets SW	0
Smothers School addition, Benning, D. C.	2
Woodridge School, Central Avenue (Woodridge district)	4
Kindergarten and industrial centers	10
Hine Junior High School addition, Seventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue SE	4
Garnet-Patterson Junior High School, Tenth and U Streets NW	12
Gordon Junior High School, Thirty-fifth Street and Wisconsin Avenue NW	11

Total

52

Respectfully yours,

FRANK W. BALLOU,
Superintendent of Schools.

ADDRESS OF HON. J. J. MANLOVE, OF MISSOURI

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have extended in the RECORD an address delivered by the Hon. J. J. MANLOVE, fifteenth district of Missouri, at the annual banquet of the Genesee County Lincoln Club, in the city of Flint, on February 9, 1927, on the subject of "Nation Building."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

NATION BUILDING

Mr. MANLOVE. My Michigan friends, words fail me in which to express my appreciation upon having been invited to come into your State and to view at first hand the varied activities of your wonderful industries. I especially appreciate the invitation by reason of the fact that it comes from a man who so well merits your confidence and who is your friend and my friend—your splendid, upstanding Representative, Hon. GRANT M. HUDSON.

The high esteem in which he is held by those whom he has the honor to represent is best known to you, but I who have worked with him almost constantly day by day for the past four years probably have a little more intimate knowledge of the high character and sterling worth of his legislative services in Washington than you, who are more than 1,000 miles away. I take great pleasure in saying to you that no man has ever gone to Washington who gave closer application to the duties of his office or who made more friends in his personal contacts or whose sincerity of purpose was more openly acknowledged than is that of your own genial Congressman.

I do not come to you with the hope of bringing you any new thought, or of even bringing you any of the well-conceived truths of life clothed in any particular garments of rhetoric. Probably the only excuse which I might give for presuming to come here is that which actuates neighbors to visit in the homes of their friends and discuss with them some of those problems which are common to all of us. Were I presumptuous enough to come into this busy section of our country and undertake to outline any new standard of life, I am sure that you would feel toward me very much as the little newsboy did toward the Rev. Billy Sunday. As the story goes, the evangelist walked out on a city street late at night and inquired of a little newsboy the way to the post office. Upon receiving a very polite and well-directed reply, the evangelist informed the little merchant of the street that if he would come to the tabernacle the next day he would show him the way to Heaven. Whereupon his skeptical little friend replied: "You show me the way to Heaven? Don't kid me like that, Mister. You don't even know the way to the post office."

However, I am sure that I shall gain much by my visit into your land of rivers and lakes—much which I may take back to my friends down in that portion of the State of Missouri which we have lovingly designated as "The Land of a Million Smiles."

I am sure it is a pardonable pride which prompts all of us to believe that the community in which we live is just a little bigger and better than the rest of the world. Yet, our visions are broadened by an interchange of fellowship, and I come to you with the hearty good wishes of the people of southwest Missouri. The interests of the people of Michigan are very similar to those of the people of Missouri. The people of Missouri have always liked the people of Michigan. They have had faith in your constancy of purpose, and I bring to you their greetings and the hope that you may come and visit us down in the southwest corner of our grand old State.

The same general policies of Government which will best serve you will best serve us. The same standard of citizenship which will build for a bigger and better Michigan will build for a bigger and better Missouri. You will find in Missouri what you will find in Michigan—three strata of society; those, like you, who are high-minded and always striving to build, and, on the other hand, some who are destroyers, who have lost the sense of right and wrong and who must be guarded by an everlasting vigilance. Then you will find in Missouri, as you will find in Michigan, another class of people who are the acceptors, and who belong to neither of the other classes, but passively take from life, that which is at their command, without making any particular contribution to those elements which build for better things.

It has been suggested that I take for my theme the subject of "Nation Building."

Such a broad subject as that of "Nation Building" can be only touched upon within the brief period of time allotted me. It is the very woof of the fabric of all history.

Let us not treat the term "nation" as synonymous with that of "government." The word "nation" comes from a Latin word meaning "to be born"; "government" from the Latin word meaning to steer, to pilot, to govern. In its early conception "nation" implied a people bound by the same ties of blood. Later it acquired a broader conception, including those bound by a common cause, working for a general goal and actuated by the same general community of thought and purpose. It is a broad term and implies a much wider field than that to which we generally ascribe it. In discussing the subject let us consider nation building in the light in which it applies to those living under the sheltering folds of the Stars and Stripes.

The question often confronts us as to what constitutes the "American character." The nationals of many other countries may be readily distinguished by their physical appearance. Without any such distinguishing features to differentiate us from the people of other nations, we must rely upon some other distinguishing standard.

Some inborn instinct prompts mankind to take pride in being a part and parcel of the world in which he moves. So long as those around him are kind, or even tolerant, he will make most any sacrifice to protect the community ideal for which his nation stands. If he believes that the outstanding national distinguishing feature is of a high standard, he will likewise take a pride in maintaining and protecting that ideal and standard. With this in mind it is easy for us to conceive that the higher the standard of individual thought and purpose the higher will be the standard of community thought and purpose. It follows as a corollary that we constantly strive for the highest individual conception of grand and noble thoughts and purposes, in order that our national thoughts may assume the most lofty heights attainable.

I congratulate you, my new-made friends, upon the part which you are playing in the building of national character. Your service is truly exemplified in the beautiful poem:

"THE BUILDER OF THE BRIDGE"

"An old man going along a highway
Came, in the evening dark and gray,
To a chasm deep and dark and wide;
He crossed the chasm in his twilight dim,
For that swollen stream had no fears for him.
But when safe across on the other side,
He turned and built a bridge to span the tide.

"'Old man,' said a fellow pilgrim standing near,
'You're wasting your time in building here;
'Your journey will end with the close of this day
And you never again shall pass this way;
So why build this bridge at the close of life's day,
When you never again shall pass this way?'

"The builder raised his gray old head,
'Kind friend, in the way I've come to-day,' he said,
'A youth shall follow the self-same path I have led,
This chasm which has been as but naught to me
To that fair-haired youth may a pitfall be.
It's true, I've built this bridge in my twilight dim
But I'm not building for self, I'm building for him.'"

In every city and hamlet and throughout the countryside of our great land will be found men and women who are constantly spanning the chasms which beset the youth of our country—men and women who, like you, are giving the best that is in them in life in order that the generations which shall follow may not be beset by the same dangers which have confronted the generations of the past. Your reward, and their reward, is not in the material things of life. It is only to be had in the consolation of knowing that your efforts have not been and will not be in vain. Thus you are engaged in building a Nation of greater strength, and to the ends of greater happiness, than that which we have attained in the past.

We will readily see that the standard of the Nation will be reflected in that business arrangement which we call government but which,

upon due reflection, we will ascertain is only the instrument of our Nation for the purpose of carrying out the ideals of national thought. We gather from history that no government can rise to higher attainments than that of its national thought, and that it will sink to decay whenever the national thought becomes satiated with ill-founded conceptions of life.

Let us contemplate as never before the responsibility of our guardianship. That we are charged individually with that responsibility is well brought home to us in the words of one of Missouri's outstanding citizens, Mr. John F. Potts:

"OUR COUNTRY'S KEEPER"

"You are your country's keeper,
The Government is but you;
You are the woof of the fabric,
Be it weak, or strong and true.

"You are of the people,
Through you she will fall or rise;
Yours is the hand that will crush her
Or raise her spires to the skies.

"You are your country's keeper,
And yours forever the blame
If the finger of scorn be pointed
At a country sunk in shame.

"Yours is the hand that will guide her,
And yours forever the praise
If she girds herself with a glory
That shall last through the length of days."

Imbued with the spirit of this guardianship, to whom and for what do we look for our inspiration?

The first distinguishing attribute of the American character should be that he believe in and have faith in that precious document—that American Rock of Gibraltar—the Constitution of the United States of America. His heart must beat in accord with those who have given their lives for the principle that all men are created equal under the law. Closely allied with the jealous guardianship of the Constitution, he must respect and obey the mandates of the laws of our land. In that connection, it is a sad thought that throughout our country we find many people who seemingly believe that they are at liberty to establish their own code of laws and accept only that portion of the law of the land which suits their individual ethics. There are those who are prone to condemn the law, the courts, and the representative law-making bodies which they themselves have had the opportunity of helping to select. Without sounding a note of warning, let me call the attention of this class of our citizens to the fact that no nation has long sustained after it has fallen into disrespect or disregard of its governing rules. Condemn them as they may, no other country has ever existed where the courts were so unsullied, where the laws were so equitable or just, and where the law-making bodies were so free from justifiable criticism, as our own. We are blest as no other country has ever been blest with the highest national attainments and the best form of government that the world has ever known. If there are those within our borders who can point to a better country, with a higher national thought or more just or liberal rules of Government, we are willing to say to them, "Good-by and Godspeed."

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

In searching for a composite figure of history in whom we may find the truest embodiment of our ideals, the hearts and minds of the American people turn intuitively to that beacon light of love and liberty, the "Rail Splitter of the Sangamon," the Great Emancipator, law lover and lawgiver, our martyred Abraham Lincoln.

Through his faith in our Bill of Rights, which he realized had been won, not only by the footsore soldiers of Valley Forge, but through a long, sacrificing fight of a liberty-loving people, we find in him the embodiment of honor and honesty, sympathy and understanding, tenderness and tolerance, a fair and fearless man among men.

We have enshrined in our hearts this champion of liberty as our ideal of the true "American character."

He left to the world a few axioms of life which make us all closer akin. When he said, "Die when I may, I want it said that I always plucked a thistle, and planted a flower, where I thought a flower would grow," he was thinking of the thistles of life which beset the lives of all mankind. He was thinking of the sadness and sorrow, the discouragements and disappointments which come to humankind. He was thinking of the consoling happiness which comes from making the pathway of our fellowman a little happier. He was thinking of the times when his heart ached for the flowers which surrounded other men, while, seemingly, only the thistles of life confronted his outlook to the attainment of his ambitions.

Some neighbor of ours over in the sunflower State, whose name I never knew, has reembodyed that beautiful thought into verse:

"I'd like to be able to lighten the load
For every poor soul I meet on the road.
I'd like to be able to dispel all the gloom
And fill every life with the sweetest perfume,
So when my time comes, and my boat draweth near
They will whisper to loved ones: 'My friend lieth here.'

"I'd like to take part in God's mighty plan
And make the world better than when I began.
I'd like to fill some definite place
And help and encourage the whole human race.
So when the clouds of the valley shall fall on my bier,
They shall echo to heaven: 'God's man lieth here.'"

Let us make that our creed. We shall not have to look far each day to find an opportunity of lightening the load for some one. We will find a thistle to pluck and a flower to plant. We will find a place where the flower will grow. Men like you, great strong, successful men of the world, will find that all around you there are young men beset by the thistles of life; young men who are at the turning of the road, who are fighting the losing fight, who need your hand to pluck from their lives the thistles of discouragement and fear and emplant there the flowers of hope and courage.

We can but gather strength when we contemplate further this great American hero, as reflected in his standard of life as he left it to us in such well-condensed statements as the following:

"It adds nothing to my satisfaction to know that another man has been disappointed.

"I say try! If we never try, we never succeed.

"I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true—I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have.

"I must stand with anybody that stands right; stand with him while he is right and part with him when he goes wrong.

"Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

"He sticks through thick and thin. I admire a man like that."

Abraham Lincoln was not only a statesman, but a politician. He believed in certain political policies, and he courageously gave them to the world.

If any man believes that any particular policy will bring greater happiness to the people than some other policy, it is his duty to advocate it.

I can see the towering figure of a mighty man carrying high the banner of a new political party. I can read the undying truths of the faultless logic emblazoned thereon; truths which were to guide our Ship of State over the uncertain seas of greenbackism, 16 to 1, and free trade, into that safe harbor of sound judgment and America for Americans.

Many political platforms have been written since that first giant of the Grand Old Party stripped himself for battle on the political arena, carrying that banner. Embodied in all of them I find nothing more self-serving to the American people than his terse statement that "if we buy our steel rails in Europe, we will have their rails and they will have our money; but if we produce the rails in America, we will have both the rails and the money."

Republicans and countrymen, are you not proud of the record which the disciples of that truth have made in bringing happiness to our country and our homes?

Time permitting, I should like to recite many of the accomplishments attained. Suffice it to say that whenever we adhere to that Republican doctrine of the protective tariff we are a prosperous Nation. When we depart from it, we immediately find ourselves in competition with the miserable peons of the poverty-ridden nations of the earth.

I have been hearing that there are those who are now proposing to reduce our tariff schedules.

If we would know the future, we have but to read the past. Armed with the disastrous record of our free-trade brethren, we are wont to exclaim to these tariff-tinkering statesmen, "Spare that tree; touch not a single bough. In adversity it has sheltered us, and we'll protect it now."

Everything I possess is invested in land. I am as interested as any man in the prosperity of the American farmer. We are always hoping for better prices. I wish I knew just how to arrange a perfect system of cooperative marketing. I wish I knew how to stabilize the prices of that which the American farmer produces. I am not sure how to bring about better conditions for the farmer, but I know for sure how we could bring about real disaster, and that would be by reducing the tariff schedules.

A sheriff had completed a scaffold in contemplation of an execution. He generously permitted the intended victim to inspect the contraption. After a somewhat exhaustive examination, the sheriff inquired concerning the prisoner's opinion of the same, to which the gentleman who was to become the central figure of the performance replied, "The blooming thing looks dangerous to me."

The reduction of our tariff schedules generally would not only look dangerous, but would almost immediately close every factory, mine, and mill in America.

It is well for us as a party, as well as a people, to take inventory once in a while. Without stopping to comment upon the many illustrious leaders who have held that banner high in hand, without stopping to comment upon the splendid record of our party's constructive achievements, let us review recent accomplishments.

Coming out of the World War the American people stood staring and stunned by the stupendous and ever-increasing national debt. They knew that history tells a brutal story of what happens to any nation when the people thereof lose faith in the stability of their national exchequer. They stood at the parting of the ways seeking guidance. Then, as of one accord, they accepted the direction of that kindly, friendly hand of the grand old party.

In "taking stock" let us begin with that day when the confiding people of our country once again turned over the business management of our Government into that guiding hand. That day we accepted the responsibility and stand charged with it.

We gave our leadership into the keeping of a great, patriotic American. Although he was immediately beset by an adversity of conditions and was preyed upon by those unworthy to even touch the hem of his garments, I thank God for the noble life of the man who came to us in that uncertain hour. Crushed by an overwhelming burden, he gave his life in a heroic effort to bring order out of chaos—generous, self-sacrificing, loving, and loved, Warren G. Harding.

I resent the cowardly weaklings who would not have dared look into that confiding countenance in life, but who, now that his lips are sealed in martyred death, attempt to besmirch his name.

I thank God for another great American who gathered from Harding's fallen hand his parchment of safe and sane statecraft. I refer, of course, to our cool, calculating, conservative Calvin Coolidge.

On the pages of that parchment were written a pledge to reduce our haunting national debt; to reduce needless governmental expenditures; to reduce Federal taxes and to restore confidence.

The pages of the ledger tell how faithfully that pledge has been kept. Our national debt has been reduced more than \$5,000,000,000. The running expenses of the Government have been reduced \$2,000,000,000 a year. Federal taxes have been decreased from \$54 to \$27 per person.

While the peoples of all the other governments on earth are in economic and social chaos, the people of our country are clothed, housed and fed as no other people ever were before. We are riding while the people of the rest of the world are walking—walking, and pulling a load.

Not perfect; not without effort to improve; not boasting; but always proud in accomplishment and sincere in purpose, we come to you once more, and, with the same sentiment expressed by another great American hero, we exclaim, "Abraham Lincoln, we are here!"

OIL AND GAS LEASES UPON UNALLOTTED LAND WITHIN EXECUTIVE-ORDER INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the oil-leasing bill passed yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks upon the oil and gas leasing bill, I wish to explain my position upon this legislation which passed the House February 23, 1927, and has for its purpose the leasing of all remaining Indian land upon Executive-order Indian reservations for oil and gas. This law at this time affects my State more than any other State involved, as New Mexico is apparently the only State now producing oil on lands which come under the provisions of this act. Before the discussion of this matter I was promised by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] time to discuss this legislation. Due to the limited allowance of time permitted for discussion, I was deprived of the opportunity of saying anything concerning the purpose of the act. I therefore extend my remarks upon this very important legislation, which tends to deal in behalf of the Indians of my State, with the leasing of the oil upon their Executive-order lands, and all the other States where Executive-order Indian lands are located.

I favored the passage of this legislation in order that the development of this oil wealth may proceed for the benefit of the Indians and also that the State might derive benefit therefrom.

The legislation is for the purpose of placing 22,500,000 acres of Indian lands, known as Executive-order lands, in the same position for future recognition as Indian treaty lands, and virtually confirming to the Indians the same rights therein to minerals found within this land as that found on other Indian lands. In fact, it establishes virtually full title to the Indians

in all their remaining Executive-order lands. This legislation had its origin in the discovery of oil upon the Navajo Treaty Reservation in New Mexico and upon Executive-order reservation in Utah. The opinion rendered by Secretary Fall, of the Interior Department, upon the appeal taken by E. M. Harrison from a decision by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, dated January 14, 1922, concerning the right for a prospecting permit under section 13 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), for a tract of land included in the Executive-order land of the Navajo Reservation situated within the State of Utah. The decision of the Secretary was:

Lands withdrawn from the public domain by Executive order for the use of the Indians are lands "owned by the United States" within the purview of that term, as used in the act of February 25, 1920, and may be included within an oil and gas prospecting permit under section 13 thereof.

To hold otherwise would result in defeating the very purpose of the act of February 25, 1920, for the Indians can not lease the lands, as their right to lease is specifically limited to lands bought and paid for; and if they are not subject to lease under the general provisions of the leasing act, then there is no other form of disposition permissible, and further legislation for the development of mineral resources upon this character of lands owned by the United States would be required.

In the view of the department no such condition was contemplated by Congress in the passage of the leasing act. For the reasons herein set forth it is the opinion of the department that the term "Indian reservations," as used in the departmental regulations of March 11, 1920, should not be construed to include lands within Executive-order Indian reservations, and it is the further view of the department and it is held that the mineral deposits, beneath the surface of such lands, specifically enumerated in the provisions of the act of February 25, 1920, are subject to lease by the department under the provision of that act.

This opinion of Secretary Fall was upheld by the United States District Court of Utah, Tillman D. Johnson presiding. (Case No. 8288E.) The language of the court in deciding the case follows:

This case, gentlemen, as indicated a moment ago, seems to have been brought by the Attorney General to cancel permits granted by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the leasing act, on the ground not that the Secretary of the Interior did not have authority to issue permits under the act but that he had no authority to issue permits upon this particular piece of land. The land it is claimed was set apart by Executive order for Indian purposes, but it does not appear that any Indian rights have attached. It is as much in the future, so far as the Indians are concerned, as it was on the 17th day of May, 1884, the day the order was made. The title, both legal and equitable, continued and was in the Government at the time this permit was issued. That being true, the Executive order could have been set aside at any time, could be set aside yet by the Executive.

My impression is, gentlemen, that the Secretary of the Interior could have set it aside under the authorities, and especially so in view of the leasing act wherein he is specifically given authority under certain rules and regulations to issue permits upon Government land.

The equities are all in favor of the defendant.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I consider that a decree entered in this case dismissing the bill?

The COURT. That will be the end of this case, yes; decree will be entered dismissing the bill; that will be the decree.

Order filed and made a part of the record.

An appeal was later taken to the Circuit Court of Appeals, No. 872, October term, 1925, as follows:

1. Was there authority in the Secretary of the Interior to issue, under the provisions of the leasing act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. L. 437, 441, Comp. Stat. 1923 Supp. sec. 4640½ss) the permit which the United States now seeks to have canceled in this suit?

If this question be answered in the negative, we ask:

2. Can this suit be maintained by the United States in equity to cancel the permit, it having been issued upon formal hearing by the Secretary of the Interior, no claim of fraud or bad faith being made, and the Government having brought no action to cancel the same for 1 year, 10 months, and 9 days after its issuance, appellees Midwest Oil Co. and Southwest Oil Co., at that time having expended over \$200,000 in developing the property for oil, which to them is a total loss if the permit is canceled?

These questions of law are by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit hereby certified to the Supreme Court in accordance with the provisions of section 239 United States Judicial Code.

The case pending there now will no doubt be dismissed by the enactment of this legislation.

The Attorney General of the United States did not agree with the former Secretary of the Interior, nor with the deci-

sion of the United States District Court of Utah as to the holding that the lands under Executive order to the Indians gave no title.

He ruled:

The important matter here, however, is that neither the courts nor Congress have made any distinction as to the character or extent of the Indians' rights as between Executive order reservations and reservations established by treaty or act of Congress. So that if the general leasing act applies to one class there seems to be no ground for holding that it does not apply to the others.

You are therefore advised that the leasing act of 1920 does not apply to Executive-order Indian reservations.

In connection I cite the case of the United States against Minnesota (Supreme Court of the United States):

Lands which have been appropriated or reserved for a lawful purpose are not public and are to be regarded as impliedly excepted from subsequent laws, grants, and disposals which do not specially disclose a purpose to include them.

If the above opinion should be followed in this case pending this legislation now enacted settles the rights of the Indians.

This matter being in dispute between officers of the Government who permitted various citizens and corporations to file and lease, under the act of February 25, 1920, upon this land. The officers of the Government permitted, what has been variously estimated, some 400 filings and some 20 permits within the lands included in this bill, much development in prospecting for oil, building of roads, making geological surveys, and in refillings, court procedure, and otherwise trying to protect their rights therein as granted by the Government officials; so that now the development of the oil resources upon the land is at a standstill and requires legislation to permit development. There are, perhaps, some 100 filings that should be permitted to go ahead under the terms of the act of February 25, 1920.

This legislation has aroused much alarm, due to the statement made that the big corporations are going to have a monopoly in the production of the oil on the land and will increase their wealth many millions of dollars. I will admit that this may be true, but I want to say it is true not only of this legislation, but of all legislation which is enacted for development of oil and gas, because the expense is so great that it requires large capital for development which the individual with small means does not have and therefore would have but little opportunity for success with such projects.

Careful attention in the sale of leases upon the land should be given by the department of Government having in charge sale of same. In my opinion the large companies which are to-day practically in one great pool will only bid the minimum premium to secure the lease of this land.

The Indian has really been receiving more money in the oil development than is good for him. In fact, the guardianship over the Indian has left him as feeble and ignorant in his business affairs with the world as he was 150 years ago.

It will never be changed until the Indian is taught or forced to get down to that essential of civilized life, and taught that he must properly utilize the returns from his income. It is only too true that with wealth he is no match for his white competitor. My opinion is that the Indian must feel the pangs of necessity before he will start to build his race to self-sustainment.

Much of the propaganda concerning Indian distress is wrong. It is true he needs protection and uplift of the proper kind and less foolish sympathy.

Whether this legislation is right and will be carried out for the Indian welfare by the best possible method will entirely depend upon that branch of government which deals with the Indians and acts as their guardian. Their benefit depends upon the honesty, integrity, and ability of the Secretary of the Interior and his Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

My desire is to have the Indians receive the greatest benefit possible from this legislation; that they be brought as soon as possible to have an intelligent view of government as citizens, and that the real rights of citizenship be adopted by them, contributing to and sustaining the institutions of government.

I further desire that the rights of all those who filed in good faith and expended money toward development be permitted to go forward under a liberal construction of this act. I see no dynamite in the bill, as some have so pictured it. I believe in honest, fair, and just legislation, and if the department will stand squarely by proper rules and regulations, this law can be so administered successfully for the great benefit of the Indian people.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House bills of the following titles:

H. R. 14831. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 15822. An act authorizing the county of Escambia, Fla., and/or the county of Baldwin, Ala., and/or the State of Florida, and/or the State of Alabama to acquire all the rights and privileges granted to the Perdido Bay Bridge & Ferry Co. by chapter 168, approved June 22, 1916, for the construction of a bridge across Perdido Bay from Lillian, Ala., to Cummings Point, Fla.;

H. R. 16024. An act to amend the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Yell and Pope County bridge district, Dardanelle and Russellville, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near the city of Dardanelle, Yell County, Ark.," approved March 3, 1925, and to extend the time for the construction of the bridge authorized thereby.

H. R. 16104. An act to amend the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Barry, State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the White River," approved March 31, 1926;

H. R. 16105. An act to amend the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Barry, State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the White River," approved March 31, 1926;

H. R. 16116. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Henderson Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, purchase or lease, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Kanawha River at or near the town of Henderson, W. Va., to a point opposite thereto in or near the city of Point Pleasant, W. Va.;

H. R. 16165. An act granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of the county of Cook, State of Illinois, to reconstruct the bridge across the Grand Calumet River at Burnham Avenue, in said county and State;

H. R. 16649. An act to extend the time for construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River in Northumberland and Snyder Counties, State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 16773. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Rochester and Monaca, Beaver County, Pa.;"

H. R. 16778. An act to extend the times for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Alton, Ill., and across the Missouri River near Bellefontaine, in Missouri;

H. R. 16887. An act granting the consent of Congress to George A. Hero and Allen S. Hackett, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 16954. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Blair, in the State of Nebraska, or its assignees, to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River between the States of Nebraska and Iowa;

H. R. 16971. An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina and Georgia State highway departments, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Savannah River;

H. R. 17131. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.; and

H. R. 17181. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Rainy River, approximately midway between the village of Spooner, in the County of Lake of the Woods, State of Minnesota, and the village of Rainy River, Province of Ontario, Canada.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5028) entitled "An act for the promotion of certain officers of the United States Army now on the retired list."

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4305) to authorize the sale, under the provisions of the act of March 12, 1926 (Public, No. 45), of surplus War Department real property, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. REED of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREENE, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. SHEPPARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled Senate bills and Senate joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

S. 2141. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment in any claims which the Assiniboine Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2615. An act to amend paragraph (1) of section 22 of the interstate commerce act by providing for the carrying of a blind person, with a guide, for one fare;

S. 4893. An act to authorize oil and gas mining leases upon unallotted lands within Executive-order Indian reservations;

S. 5671. An act to amend paragraph (c) of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the transportation act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924;

S. 5699. An act relating to the admission of candidates to the Naval Academy; and

S. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to lend tents and camp equipment for the use of the reunion of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held at Tampa, Fla., in April, 1927.

COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 11064. An act for the relief of R. W. Hilderbrand; and

H. R. 15547. An act to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes.

RECESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Reserving the right to object, is there anything to be taken up besides the Private Calendar?

Mr. TILSON. Under the special order nothing can be taken up except the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by Mr. CHINDELOM as Speaker pro tempore.

HORACE G. KNOWLES

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing under the rule the conference report on the bill (S. 978) for the relief of Horace G. Knowles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ordered printed under the rule.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 978) for the relief of Horace G. Knowles, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend, and do recommend, to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agrees to the same.

CHARLES L. UNDERHILL,
BIRD J. VINCENT,
JOHN C. BOX,

Managers on the part of the House.

RICE W. MEANS,
ROBT. N. STANFIELD,
THOMAS F. BAYARD,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 978) for the relief of Horace G. Knowles, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the House reduces the amount from \$7,296.49 to \$1,666.67.

CHARLES L. UNDERHILL,
BIRD J. VINCENT,
JOHN C. BOX,

Managers on the part of the House.

THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I wrote a letter to General Clem, in charge of the National Tribune, to find out whether he is collecting money from the old Federal soldiers in respect to these petitions. I have his letter in reply. I would like to put my letter and his reply in the Record. I ask unanimous consent to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1927.

Mr. JOHN L. CLEM,

Vice President National Tribune,
P. O. box 1893, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLEM: I have your favor of the 1st instant.

Quite a serious charge has been preferred against your publication by Congressman TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, who claims that you are collecting money from veterans and their friends in connection with your sending out blank forms of petitions to be signed and you submitting same to Members of Congress thereafter.

I would like for you to please answer the following questions definitely and without evasion:

First. Are you collecting any money from any veterans or their friends?

Second. If so, from them in how many States have you collected money?

Third. What is the total amount that you have collected from each State, giving the State and amount?

Fourth. Give me the names and addresses of all parties in the State of Texas from whom you have collected any money and the amounts, respectively, collected from them.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

(John McElroy, acting president; Hays Haymaker, secretary; D. L. Rice, treasurer; John L. Clem, W. L. Mattocks, John Lewis Smith, vice presidents.)

NATIONAL TRIBUNE,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1927.

"To care for him who has borne the battle and for his widow and orphans." (Abraham Lincoln.)

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLANTON: I have your letter of the 5th instant.

Replying to your inquiry, would say that the National Tribune is not soliciting or receiving any contributions or donations in connection with sending out blank forms of petitions nor for personal service rendered veterans and widows, whether subscribers or nonsubscribers. The National Tribune is soliciting subscriptions to this publication. The subscription rate is \$2 per year. This is the regular subscription rate established in 1919.

The National Tribune has a nation-wide circulation. With the exception of the American Legion Monthly, the official organ of the American Legion, it has the largest circulation of any veteran publication. The National Tribune was established in Washington nearly 47 years ago, and while it is not the official organ of any veteran society, has generally been recognized as the mouthpiece of the veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War.

The National Tribune, at its own expense, without donations or contributions, has mailed blank petitions to approximately a quarter million veterans and widows who are interested in securing for themselves a "living pension."

While a meager increase of pension was granted to some Civil War veterans by the act of July 3, 1926, only about 1 in 12 of the Civil War widows received any benefit under that act. The increase granted to widows benefited only those who had been married to soldier husband prior to or during his service in the Civil War. A widow married the day after soldier husband's discharge is barred from increase under the act of July 3, 1926.

The Invalid Pension Committee of the House during the first session of the Sixty-ninth Congress unanimously reported a bill that would have given a \$72 rating for all surviving veterans and for those widows married prior to 1915 a \$50 rating. We quote from the report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, as follows:

"The committee regards this bill as an emergency measure that should be promptly passed, in fulfillment of the obligation the Nation

owes to the old veterans whose heroic service and sacrifices in the Nation's defense made forever secure the Union of the States and the perpetuity of the Republic.

"Whatever more is to be done for these old veterans and widows must be done soon. They are fast passing to their reward, where a grateful Nation can do no more to pay the debt it owes to them."

The report of the operations of the Bureau of Pensions shows that 18,556 Civil War veterans died during the year 1926 and that 22,115 Civil War widows died during the same period. You will realize from these figures that any Civil War pension bill is in reality an "emergency measure."

Not only are the veteran organizations aroused to the inadequacy of the act of July 3, 1926, but the voters in general feel that justice has not been done, as evidenced by their signatures on these petitions.

From your own personal experience you must realize how difficult it is to get action on any bill, no matter how meritorious.

You will recall the difficulty encountered in securing a chance to vote on the Spanish War bill last spring, despite the fact that Congress to a man favored it.

More recently you have encountered difficulties in bringing to a vote the bill which would grant relief to Indian war veterans. There is no class more deserving than these Indian war veterans, "The Winners of the West." There is no class that has been more neglected than Indian war veterans and the Indian war widows, and you say these have been discriminated against in pension matters.

The Civil War veterans and widows face the same condition of inaction in Congress.

The National Tribune is circulating petitions to bring to the attention of each Member of Congress the overwhelming sentiment in his own district for the enactment of a bill that will grant adequate relief, especially to those Civil War widows who received no benefit under the act of July 3, 1926.

Those petitions have been circulated at the expense of the National Tribune and not from funds derived from contributions or donations.

It would appear from Mr. TREADWAY'S speech that there is one Civil War widow in his district who has subscribed several years in advance.

The National Tribune has on its mailing list quite a number, both veterans and widows, who have subscribed for several years in advance. In case of the death of the subscriber, the paper is mailed to the member of the family notifying us of the death.

During our years of publication there have been thousands of cases where, on death of the veteran, the subscription has been continued by the widow, and, on her demise, by a son or daughter whose interest in the paper and what it is trying to accomplish has been maintained.

Again referring to your query we repeat that the National Tribune is neither soliciting nor accepting contributions or donations.

The National Tribune has on its subscription list a number of Civil War, Indian war, and Spanish-American War veterans and widows residing in Texas. If you would like a copy of the Texas subscription list, we would be glad to furnish same to you.

Yours most respectfully,

JNO. L. CLEM.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order the session will be devoted to bills on the Private Calendar to which no objection is offered, beginning with the star number. The Clerk will report the first one.

THE COAST GUARD

The first business in order on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 4287) amending section 3 of the act approved January 12, 1923, entitled "An act to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes."

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act approved January 12, 1923, entitled "An act to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes," be amended by adding thereto the following proviso:

"Provided further, That commissioned officers Daniel P. Foley, Francis M. Dunwoody, Howard M. Broadbent, Frank H. Newcomb, and Horace B. West shall have the rank of commodore on the retired list without any increase of pay by reason of the passage of this act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CAPT. REGINALD ROWAN BELKNAP, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16703) authorizing the President to appoint Capt. Reginald Rowan Belknap, United States Navy, retired, a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, with the understanding that the suggestion made by the Secretary of the Navy will be carried out by way of amendment, there will be no objection from me. He recommended certain amendments. I do not know whether they are put in the bill or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. BURDICK], who introduced the bill, is not here, but I can say that the bill reported out has the approval of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I can state, if the gentleman from Texas will yield, that the bill is reported to the House without any amendments appearing in the bill. If there are any amendments suggested by the Secretary of the Navy, I am satisfied they are embodied in the bill as reported to the House. This bill has the approval of the department.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it the only bill that the Secretary of the Navy made any report on? Is it the bill No. 15291? This bill, reported by the committee, is No. 16703. I would like to have some assurance that this bill, H. R. 16703, is identical with the bill H. R. 15291, with the suggestions of the Secretary of the Navy incorporated therein.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is not that the reason? It bears a later number.

Mr. BLANTON. I was trying to find out.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The bill H. R. 16703 has the approval of the department. I do not know what improvements the Secretary of the Navy suggested as to another bill, but I can state that this bill has the approval of the department.

Mr. ANDREW. The Secretary recommends in his letter that the word "in" be inserted after the word "increase."

Mr. BLANTON. I am not captious, but I think when a committee has a report from the Secretary of a department they should put it in their report. This bill was introduced on January 26. It was reported January 27. The committee report is dated January 27, and yet the only report that appears in this committee report from the Secretary of the Navy is dated January 11.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the Secretary's letter to the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this bill reintroduced in compliance with the suggestion made by the Secretary?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I can not answer that accurately, but I know this bill has the approval of the Secretary, and that is the testimony of the witnesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the exceptionally meritorious service of Capt. Reginald Rowan Belknap, United States Navy, retired, in command of Mine Squadron 1 of the mine force during the operation of laying mines in the North Sea, and for his excellent work in connection with the equipping of these ships for mine-laying duty, the President is hereby authorized to appoint him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy: *Provided,* That no increase nor back pay or allowances of any kind shall accrue as a result of the passage of this act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

WILLIAM W. GREEN

Mr. TUCKER rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. TUCKER. To ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 649, the bill S. 2139, which was objected to at the last time, be returned to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman ask to go back of the star?

Mr. TUCKER. Yes. This bill was objected to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. He has withdrawn his objection. I ask unanimous consent to take it up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that the unanimous-consent order reads:

On motion of Mr. TILSON, by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That on Thursday, February 24, 1927, not later than 6 o'clock p. m., it shall be in order to move that the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock p. m., at which time it shall be in order to consider unobjected bills on the Private Calendar, beginning where the last call was ended.

I do not think that would prevent a return.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I would suggest, if we can get out of the jam and finish the calendar, we can return to this.

Mr. TUCKER. I have conferred with the leader on the other side.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Idaho is in exactly the same situation here. He wants to ask unanimous consent to return to another bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia to return to Calendar No. 649?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill S. 2139?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to pay to Warrant Officer William W. Green, out of any appropriation now or hereafter available for "pay, etc., of the Army," the sum of \$7,897.80, to reimburse him for pay, for additional pay to officers for length of service, for rental allowance, and for subsistence allowance, withheld on account of absence from his post of duty from January 1, 1923, to September 15, 1925, such absence having been caused by his arrest, conviction, and confinement in the State of North Carolina for an offense against such State, for which he has been unconditionally pardoned by the Governor of North Carolina.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DISBURSING AGENTS OF THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of H. R. 14567, a bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to disbursing agents of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in certain cases, which was considered at the last meeting and objected to by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who later read the report and withdraws his objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to return to the consideration of H. R. 14567, Calendar No. 657. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any funds available for the construction of the American Falls Reservoir, Minidoka Federal irrigation project, Idaho, whether appropriated by Congress or contributed by water contractors participating in the construction of that reservoir for expenditure by the United States, shall be available for payment for damages for the removal of improvements from the right of way acquired for said reservoir; and the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow payment of same, or to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing agents of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, for the payment of any or all of said damages when made on properly executed vouchers, and under contracts made between the respective owners of such improvements and the United States, as follows:

Allen Oil Co., \$1,000; Minnie Adolf, \$400; William Bartel, \$520; Boise Payette Lumber Co., \$550; Evans Mercantile Co., \$9,500; Bert Hager, \$150; John F. Kosanke (guardian of Harold J. Kosanke, a minor), \$150; J. A. McCool, \$125; J. P. Mehlhoff, \$300; Power City Garage, \$2,850; and the Power County Fair Association, \$2,400.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

JENNIE WYANT

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15197) for the relief of Jennie Wyant.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question about this bill. Of course, this ought to be paid. This lady had her leg broken but the hospital charges seem to me to be ridiculously high.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HOOPER. We went over the matter of the hospital charges very carefully in the committee. Of course, we had to use the proof we had about the matter before the committee, and it seemed there was no doubt about the amount charged by the hospital. I assure the gentleman from Texas we cut this down to the very bone and as far as we could.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think it is cut down to the bone very much. It occurs to me that for a hospital to charge \$569.50 is outrageous for treating a broken leg.

Mr. HOOPER. But the gentleman will remember that this lady was in the hospital for 61 days. She was being treated for a compound fracture of her leg. Of course, she had no control over the amount of the hospital charges.

Mr. BLANTON. Just because the Government is paying we ought not to pay a hospital that puts in a ridiculous bill for treating a broken leg. The nurse's bill is also outrageous, and from the size of the nurse's bill it would seem the person was in terrible shape. A broken leg, even a compound fracture, is not a serious matter.

Mr. HOOPER. Will the gentleman yield for one minute more?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. HOOPER. I do not think the gentleman would want to deprive this lady of this payment.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want to deprive her of anything; but I do think this is a most outrageous charge. When our children happen to have limbs broken we take them to the hospital, and then we are absolutely at the mercy of the hospital. Whatever they charge we have to pay; whatever the nurses charge we have to pay, simply because we do not want to quibble about such things. But just because the Government has to pay a bill of this kind and the money is to be taken out of the Treasury, there is no reason why a hospital should charge such a ridiculous amount as this for treating a broken leg.

Mr. HOOPER. The gentleman knows what brought about this accident?

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not stand in the way of this, but I think the committee ought to look very carefully into this kind of a claim.

Mr. HOOPER. I thank the gentleman, because this is a meritorious claim.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jennie Wyant, of Weston, W. Va., the sum of \$2,500, which shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of said Jennie Wyant against the United States for damages resulting to her because of a personal injury received by her on account of a rocket which was discharged by soldiers in the military service of the United States, who were engaged in giving an exhibition at the Lewis County fair in Lewis County, State of West Virginia, September 29, 1920.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following parties the sums herein stated, which shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of said parties against the United States as a result of a personal injury received by Jennie Wyant on account of a rocket which was discharged by soldiers in the military service of the United States who were engaged in giving an exhibition at the Lewis County fair in Lewis County, State of West Virginia, September 29, 1920:

"(1) Jennie Wyant, of Weston, Va., the sum of \$546.

"(2) General Hospital of Weston, Weston, W. Va., the sum of \$569.50.

"(3) Frances V. Dodge, of Weston, W. Va., the sum of \$384.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

CITIZENS' NATIONAL BANK, PETTY, TEX.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15678) for the relief of the Citizens' National Bank, of Petty, Tex.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, Senate bill 5466 should be substituted for this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that Senate bill 5466 be considered in lieu of the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,380.83 to the Citizens' National Bank, of Petty, Tex., or its assigns, on account of unavoidable loss sustained through theft from robbery from said bank of war savings certificate stamps of the series of 1919, which said bank held as duly authorized agent of the second class for the sale of war savings certificate stamps, and which loss resulted from no fault or negligence on the part of the said Citizens' National Bank, of Petty, or any of its officers or employees.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

House bill 15678 was laid on the table.

NEW AMSTERDAM CASUALTY CO.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2054) for the return of \$5,000 to the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1787) be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, is the Senate bill identical?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is identically the same bill.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is it? Will the gentleman tell us what the bill is?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Has the gentleman from Nebraska the House bill, H. R. 2054?

Mr. HOWARD. No, sir; but I have consulted my administrators here and they tell me it is all right. Let it go. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the New Amsterdam Casualty Co., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 in adjustment of an equal amount heretofore received from said company in forfeiture of a bond guaranteeing the appearance in the United States District Court, Eastern District of New York, of one Antonio Cassese, who, after the forfeiture of said bond, was apprehended, tried, and convicted.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CHARLES A. MAYO, T. S. TAYLOR, AND FRANK HICKEY

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 70) for the relief of Charles A. Mayo, T. S. Taylor, and Frank Hickey.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be paid, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles A. Mayo the sum of \$1,120, to T. S. Taylor the sum of \$90, and to Frank Hickey the sum of \$90, on account of property lost by fire at the United States reclamation camp at Rimrock, Wash., May 11, 1920.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 2, strike out the words "that there be paid" and insert in lieu thereof "that the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JOSEPH B. TANNER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 467) for the relief of Joseph B. Tanner.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Joseph B. Tanner, of Shiprock, N. Mex., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$250, for reimbursement of the amount forfeited by him for nondelivery at the Navajo Springs Indian Agency, Colo., of 385 head of 2-year-old heifers of Hereford blood, and 15 bulls not less than three-fourths Hereford blood, 2-year-olds and 3-year-olds, the sum in question having been deposited by him in the form of a certified check guaranteeing the performance of his contract to deliver these animals, which check was forfeited to the Government on account of his failure to make delivery under his agreement through a misunderstanding of the true meaning and intent of his contract as between the said Tanner and the inspecting official representing the Government.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote, by which the bill was passed, was laid on the table.

MARK J. WHITE

The next business on the private calendar was the bill (S. 2242) for the relief of Mark J. White.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why should the people's Treasury make good court costs between two private litigants?

Mr. UNDERHILL. The claimant in question was merely acting as an agent of the Government, and he had to pay the costs while protecting the Government property and the Government's rights in the case.

Mr. BLANTON. He has not paid them.

Mr. UNDERHILL. He had paid them.

Mr. ARENTZ. This man White was acting for the Government at the time, and this suit was instituted in his name and the suit was carried on. He paid the court costs as an agent of the Government and now he desires to be reimbursed for the payment he made.

Mr. BLANTON. In what way did the Government benefit in this suit?

Mr. ARENTZ. It was a suit for Government property. He was holding the property in trust for the Government. If the gentleman will read the report on the bill he will notice there is a report by Mr. Mellon, which states the case very clearly, and in my opinion this case is justified in every respect.

Mr. BLANTON. I have read Mr. Mellon's report and I call the gentleman's attention to what Mr. Mellon says about the costs not having been paid.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I want to answer one at a time. Here is what Mr. Mellon says:

In view of the circumstances set forth above, and the further fact that this officer is being pressed for payment by the judgment creditor in this case, it is requested that appropriate steps be taken with a view

to the introduction of a bill along the lines suggested in the accompanying draft, and your active support of such a bill will be greatly appreciated.

This would indicate that Mr. White had not paid the costs but was being pressed for them.

Mr. UNDERHILL. But the Comptroller of the Currency is demanding payment, I will state for the gentleman's information.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts think the Government is liable in this case?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I have the word of the Attorney General that the responsibility of Doctor White for these costs grows out of the sole fact he was in charge of the property as an officer of the Government assigned by competent authority to such duty, and in my judgment equity requires that he should be relieved of this liability and from the payment of the costs in question.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this Mark J. White related in any way to Dr. William A. White? [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. I think not.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Mark J. White, an officer of the United States Public Health Service, Treasury Department, the sum of \$163.75, from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Such sum represents a judgment for costs assessed against Mark J. White by the Supreme Court of the United States on December 10, 1923, in case No. 172, October term, 1923, growing out of the case of William Leather et al. v. White et al. for the recovery of certain real estate in the custody of the said Mark J. White as an official of the United States, said sum to be paid to the plaintiffs in the above cause, and, when accepted, to be in full settlement of this judgment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JORDAN KIDWELL

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15487) to correct the military record of Jordan Kidwell.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Jordan Kidwell, who was a member of Company G, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the — day of — : *Provided,* That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "the" insert the word "1st," and after the word "of" insert the words "April, 1865."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID PARRETT

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15637) for the relief of David Parrett.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws, or of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, David Parrett, who was a private in Company I, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the 5th of October, 1865: *Provided,* That no back pay, pension, or bounty shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS TO ACCEPT FROM THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI A MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4141) authorizing certain officers of the United States Marine Corps to accept from the Republic of Haiti "The medal for distinguished service."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. I would like to ask why these bills are not referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We discussed that matter in the committee, and it seems to me the bills are wrongly referred. This is an international matter and ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why his committee claims jurisdiction of these bills?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I can enlighten the gentleman. The reason is there are so many of these bills where men are to receive gifts and decorations that no one committee of the House can take care of them, and therefore they have been distributing them to other committees of the House. I want to know what the policy of the Government is going to be. The framers of the Constitution wisely sought to prevent Americans from accepting decorations and presents from foreign governments. It takes an act of Congress to permit them to do it, and yet we are getting around the law. What is going to be the policy of our Government in reference to decorations and presents from foreign governments? I have had presents offered me because of work done for individuals since I have been in Congress. I would not accept them. I do not think officials of the Government ought to accept decorations and presents from foreign governments.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield the floor to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not care for the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has asked a parliamentary question, and the Chair would like to say that under Rule 22, section 1, Members having petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature to present may deliver them to the Clerk, indorsing their names and the reference or disposition to be made thereof.

So the Member introducing the bill designates the committee to which he thinks it should be referred.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Is that permitted by the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will read the rule:

Rule 22, section 1. Members having petitions or memorials or bills of a private nature to present may deliver them to the Clerk, indorsing their names and the reference or disposition to be made thereof.

Mr. BLANTON. This is not a bill of a private nature. It is a bill that affects the public policy and ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee did not claim it, and when they do not claim jurisdiction of a bill when it is reported the committee reporting the bill has jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the question of jurisdiction can always be raised before the bill is taken up for final action.

Mr. BLANTON. When a committee that has not jurisdiction reports a bill, the committee that ought to have jurisdiction waives its right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that section 2 of Rule XXII provides—

that an erroneous reference of a petition or private bills under this clause shall not confer jurisdiction upon the committee to consider or report the same.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair will find rulings of various Chairmen that where a committee permits it to be reported and does not claim jurisdiction, it waives it rights.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have some questions that I want to ask. I have been down in Haiti. This bill says that this decoration is to be conferred by the Haitian Government. I discovered while in Haiti that there is no Haitian Government other than that which is conducted by the American marines. I know, because I have been there. I do not get that second hand. Are we going to begin a policy now of having the United States Government issue decorations to several favored officers on its own authority? The Haitian Government has no authority at all. It does not exist except as the United States marines permit it to exist. Somebody suggests that I may get into a discussion of Nicaragua before I get through, but I shall get into a discussion of Nicaragua pretty soon. I am discussing Haiti now. I wish some gentleman would kindly tell me what kind of a decoration this is. What does it look like?

Mr. DREWRY. These medals are conferred on these officers who have been assigned by the United States Government to do purely administrative work in Haiti, under a treaty which the United States Government has with the Government of Haiti. That is why the medals are being conferred. The medals are in the hands of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. HOWARD. Are they ribbon medals or metal?

Mr. DREWRY. I could not tell the gentleman. I have never seen them.

Mr. HOWARD. Well, let it go.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, are these officers retired officers?

Mr. DREWRY. I could not answer that. They were assigned to duty by this Government to the Government of Haiti and received pay from the Government of Haiti.

Mr. VAILE. Are they now retired?

Mr. DREWRY. I do not think so.

Mr. VAILE. I shall not object to this bill or others on this calendar, but I think it is a very poor practice to allow American officers prior to their retirement to accept medals or rewards from other countries.

Mr. DREWRY. My impression is that they have not been retired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. That is the reason the bill is here.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, to-night was set apart for consideration of bills unobjectionable to on this calendar. I shall be obliged to call for the regular order hereafter on all these bills. This is not the proper time to discuss the bills, but it is the proper time to pass such bills as may pass the scrutiny of the Members present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts surely does not want to precipitate the adjournment of the House this early to-night?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I would not deprive the gentleman from Texas from objecting to any or all of these bills.

Mr. BLANTON. What I mean is this: The gentleman knows that there is but a handful of us here, and we have come here at the sacrifice of our own convenience and pleasure to attend to this business to-night. The gentleman has got to let us find out something about some of these bills or he will precipitate an adjournment.

Mr. UNDERHILL. In spite of the gentleman's threat, it seems to me that the proper way to carry on the business is to carry it on under the rule under which we are working.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what we are doing, and the gentleman is now taking up time that ought to be devoted to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lieut. Col. Douglas C. McDougal, Lieut. Col. James J. Meade, Maj. Alexander A. Vandegrift, Maj. Harry L. Smith, Capt. William H. Rupertus, and Capt. William F. Beattie, all of the United States Marine Corps, be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept from the Republic of Haiti "The medal for distinguished service" which has been tendered to each of said officers, through the Department of State, in appreciation of services rendered the said Republic of Haiti.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair begs the indulgence of the House in order that the RECORD may be complete in the event that the question should arise again during the consideration of these bills, and calls attention to a further observation in the Manual on page 375, as follows:

* * * a point of order is good when the bill comes up for consideration either in the House or in Committee of the Whole.

That is, a point of order upon the question of jurisdiction.

FARRAH DANE RICHARDSON

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12577) for the relief of Farrah Dane Richardson.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, is there not a similar Senate bill on the Speaker's table?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was about to inquire whether there is objection to the substitute of the Senate bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate bill, S. 4405.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to accept for enlistment in the Navy, without regard to physical or other qualifications, Farrah Dane Richardson, formerly chief electrician's mate, United States Navy, in the rating held by him when last discharged therefrom, and to transfer him immediately to the Fleet Naval Reserves in that rating, and with all the benefits and emoluments thereof which he would have been entitled to receive had he been transferred thereto under the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916 (vol. 39, Stat. L. p. 589), at date of his discharge from the naval service at expiration of enlistment, August 25, 1921.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF BETHLEHEM SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION (LTD.)

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12813) for the relief of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will get the permission of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. COYLE. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts will not refuse.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I regret, but I must ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

WILLIAM H. SANTELMANN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14718) for the promotion and retirement of William H. Santelmann, leader of the United States Marine Band.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon application of William H. Santelmann, leader of the United States Marine Band, for retirement after 36 years' service, the President is authorized to appoint him a captain in the United States Marine Corps and place him upon the retired list of the Marine Corps with the retired pay and allowances of that rank: *Provided*, That the limitation in section 1 of the act of June 10, 1922, relative to counting service for purposes of pay for officers appointed on and after July 1, 1922, shall not apply: *Provided further*, That all active service as a musician in or leader of the United States Marine Band shall be counted in computing length of service for longevity pay purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very essential that Members of this House have a chance for a few minutes on these bills if they are objected to, and unless this procedure is followed it will be necessary for me to ask for an adjournment of this House right now.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has that right if he wishes to assert it.

Mr. ARENTZ. Exactly, and we are going to do so from now on.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has a perfect right.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nevada rise?

Mr. ARENTZ. I have said my say with regard to two or three minutes' discussion on these bills. I think it is very essential.

COMMANDER ROBERT E. TOD

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14926) to authorize Commander Robert E. Tod, United States Naval Reserve, to accept from the French Government the brevet and insignia of "Commandeur de la Legion d'Honneur."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order this bill has been improperly referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs when it should have gone to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I do that to get a specific ruling from the Chair, so we will have a precedent from now on.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the point of order, the custom has been from time immemorial to refer all bills seeking to permit officers of the marine or naval forces to receive medals, and so forth, to the Committee on Naval Affairs and officers of the Army to receive medals from other governments to the Committee on Military Affairs. Now, if the Naval Affairs Committee has not jurisdiction, we are not so anxious to consume our time in investigating these cases. It has been the practice in the past for this kind of legislation to be referred to those two committees. If the Foreign Affairs Committee has jurisdiction, we would be glad to know, so that we can be relieved of that responsibility.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I will not embarrass the Chair to pass upon the point, but, reserving the right to object for a second, I am one American who wants the French Government to understand that we do not want anything they have got except the money they owe us, and I do not want to see an American accept a decoration from the French Government until they make some attempt to pay their honest debts. I object to this bill.

CAPT. THOMAS L. JOHNSON, UNITED STATES NAVY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15482) granting permission to Capt. Thomas L. Johnson, United States Navy, to accept a brevet and medal of the French Legion of Honor, tendered by the President of the French Republic.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next one.

REAR ADMIRAL ALBERT P. NIBLACK, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15916) to authorize Rear Admiral Albert P. Niblack, United States Navy, retired, to accept certain decorations from the Principality of Monaco and from the Kingdom of Denmark.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Rear Admiral Albert P. Niblack, United States Navy, retired, be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept from the Principality of Monaco the decoration of "Grand Officer of the Order of St. Charles" and from the Kingdom of Denmark the decoration of "Commander of the Order of Daneborg," which have been tendered said officer, through the Department of State, in appreciation of services rendered by him in his official capacity as director of the International Hydrographic Bureau.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to inquire if the word "Daneborg" at the beginning of line 8 is correctly spelled? If not, the proper correction will be made. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE BY CERTAIN NAVY OFFICERS OF DECORATIONS FROM PERU AND ECUADOR

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15928) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy to accept from the Republic of Peru decoration and diploma of the Order of the Sun and from the Republic of Ecuador decoration and diploma of the Estralla Abdon Calderon.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Rear Admiral William C. Cole, of the United States Navy, be, and hereby is, authorized to accept from the Republic

of Peru the decoration and diploma of Grand Officer of the Order of the Sun, and from the Republic of Ecuador the decoration and diploma of the Estralla Abdon Calderon, first class; that Capt. Harry K. Cage, of the United States Navy, be, and hereby is, authorized to accept from the Republic of Peru the decoration and diploma of commander of the Order of the Sun, and from the Republic of Ecuador the decoration and diploma of Estralla Abdon Calderon, first class; and that Commander John F. Shafroth and Commander Marshall Collins, both of the United States Navy, be, and hereby are, authorized to accept from the Republic of Peru the decoration and diploma of officer of the Order of the Sun, and from the Republic of Ecuador the decoration and diploma of the Estralla Abdon Calderon, second class, which have been tendered to each of said officers through the Department of State on the occasion of the visit of the U. S. S. *Birmingham* to the said Republic of Peru and the said Republic of Ecuador in the month of May in the year 1923.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ACCEPTANCE BY NAVY OFFICERS OF DECORATIONS BY GREECE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15981) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps to accept certain decorations conferred upon them by the Government of Greece.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in reading this bill over hurriedly I am not sure whether it embraces all the officers in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps or not. But if there are any officers in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who have not yet been decorated by some foreign government, I hope the Sergeant at Arms will notify them, and have them come in and be decorated. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-named officers be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept from the Government of Greece the decorations mentioned below after their respective names, which decorations have been tendered to each of these officers, through the Department of State, in appreciation of services rendered the said Government of Greece: Rear Admiral Philip Andrews, United States Navy, Grand Cross of the Holy Order of the Redeemer; Capt. F. T. Evans, United States Navy, Commander of the Holy Order of the Redeemer; Capt. F. D. Berrien, United States Navy, Commander of the Holy Order of the Redeemer; Commander J. S. Woodward (MS), United States Navy, Holy Order of the Redeemer of the First Class; Commander R. A. Spruance, United States Navy, Holy Order of the Redeemer of the first class; Commander W. F. Halsey, jr., United States Navy, Holy Order of the Redeemer of the first class; Commander A. G. Stirling, United States Navy, Holy Order of the Redeemer of the first class; Lieut. Commander W. J. Hine (SC), United States Navy, Holy Order of the Redeemer of the first class; Lieut. H. O'D. Hunter, United States Navy, Holy Order of the Redeemer of the second class; Maj. M. B. Humphrey, United States Marine Corps, Holy Order of the Redeemer of the first class.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MEDALS CONFERRED BY THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16067) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and civilian employees of the Navy Department to accept certain medals tendered them by the Republic of China, and to authorize Capt. Walter S. Crosley, United States Navy, to accept a medal of honor and merit and a diploma tendered him by the Republic of Haiti.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate bill S. 4622 will be substituted in lieu of the House bill.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-named officers and civilians be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept from the Republic of China the medals mentioned below after their respective names, which medals have been tendered to such officers and civilians, through the Department of State, in appreciation of services rendered by them to the hydrographic mission of the Chinese Government during the years 1925 and 1926: Vice Admiral Albert P. Niblack, United States Navy, First Order of Wen Hu; Capt. Walter S. Crosley, United States Navy, Second Medal of Wen Hu; Capt. Paul P. Blackburn, United States Navy, Third Medal of Wen Hu; J. H. Larrabee, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., Third Order of Chia Ho Medal; and A. E. Weeks, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., Fourth Order of Chia Ho Medal.

SEC. 2. That Capt. Walter S. Crosley, United States Navy, be, and he is hereby, further authorized to accept a medal of honor and merit and a diploma tendered to him by the Republic of Haiti in appreciation of services rendered by him to the said Republic of Haiti.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the similar House bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MARY H. DOUGHERTY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 1641) for the relief of Mary H. Dougherty.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid, from the appropriation for beneficiaries of officers who die while on the active list of the Navy, to Mary H. Dougherty, widow of Horace DeB. Dougherty, late lieutenant, United States Navy, an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate to which the said Horace DeB. Dougherty would have been entitled to receive had he been employed on active duty at the time of his death.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE BY NAVAL OFFICERS OF DECORATIONS FROM THE REPUBLIC OF CHILE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 3464) authorizing certain officers of the United States Navy to accept from the Republic of Chile the order of Al Mérito.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-named officers of the United States Navy be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept from the Republic of Chile the order Al Mérito, of the class hereinafter respectively designated, conferred on them by said Republic in evidence of its appreciation and good will upon the visit, in the year 1921, to that country of the Pacific Fleet, the said officers being then and there with said fleet and holding, respectively, the rank hereinafter indicated, to wit: Admiral Hugh Rodman, first class; Vice Admiral Clarence S. Williams, first class; Rear Admiral J. L. Jayne, first class; Rear Admiral J. S. McKean, first class; Capt. C. L. Hussey, first class; Capt. S. E. Moses, first class; Capt. W. V. Pratt, first class; Capt. T. W. Leutze, first class; Capt. E. L. Bennett, first class; Commander W. F. Halsey, jr., first class; Lieut. Commander H. B. Meclary, first class; Lieut. Commander D. C. Godwin, first class; Lieut. C. W. A. Campbell,

second class; Lieut. J. B. Reinburg, jr., second class; and Lieut. J. L. McCrea, second class.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next one.

JOSEPH ROSEN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12191) to reimburse Joseph Rosen, formerly of the United States Navy, for losses sustained while carrying out his duties.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Paymaster General of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reimburse Joseph Rosen, formerly fireman, third class, of the United States Navy, for the amount of \$84.10, for the loss of his personal effects at Pelham Bay Park Training Station, N. Y., June 4, 1918, while he was carrying out his duties under the direction and orders of the commandant of the station. The amount of \$84.10 is hereby appropriated for this specific purpose in accordance with the "Act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service."

With the following committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be paid to Joseph Rosen, formerly fireman, third class, United States Navy, from the current appropriation for "Pay of the Navy," the sum of \$84.10 to reimburse him for the loss of his personal effects at Pelham Bay Park Training Station, N. Y., June 4, 1918, which loss occurred without fault or negligence on the part of said Rosen and while he was carrying out his duties under orders of his superior officers.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair permit a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will not the present acting Speaker adopt the same plan that our regular Speaker adopts in passing such bills, that when no objection is offered the Chair will not have the bill read again, but will state that without objection the bill will be engrossed and read a third time and passed, or, if a Senate bill, read the third time and passed? That will save three-fourths of our time to-night, and we can clear up this calendar of the good bills. That has been done by Speaker LONGWORTH a half dozen times this session. Most of our time is taken up by the actual reading of the text of the bills.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The present occupant of the Chair believes the House should at least know what the purpose of the bill is.

Mr. BLANTON. But after the bill is read not half the Members know what is in it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is nothing before the House, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

JAMES H. MCCORMICK

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12604) for the relief of James H. McCormick.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James H. McCormick, of Suffolk County, dependent father of Arthur James McCormick, first-class seaman, late of the United States Navy, the sum of \$— as six months' gratuity pay, which amount would have been paid by act of Congress approved June 4, 1920, but for the omission through ignorance or error of his son to designate beneficiary before he was killed in the performance of his service duty.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be paid from the appropriation 'Pay of the Navy, 1925,' to Mary McCormick, mother of Arthur James McCormick, late seaman, first class, United States Navy, the sum of \$356.40, being an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate received by said McCormick at the date of his death."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I suggest a change in the title. The bill is for the relief of James H. McCormick but it should be amended to read for the relief of Mary McCormick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the title will be amended as suggested by the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE ORDER AL MÉRITO

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16103), authorizing the acceptance, from the Republic of Chile, of the order Al Mérito, conferred on certain officers of the United States Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, I would like to ask my friend from Kentucky what is the order Al Mérito?

Mr. THATCHER. It is the order of merit.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Why is it issued?

Mr. THATCHER. It is just a decoration given in honor or appreciation of meritorious service.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I know it is the order of merit but I was just wondering why they issued it to United States marines?

Mr. THATCHER. It is not issued to marines, but these are officers of the American Navy, who were with the Pacific Fleet that went to Chile in 1921 as an evidence of our good will toward this sister Republic at a very opportune time, as our Government thought. The American ambassador to Chile said, at the conclusion of this visit of our fleet, that as a result of that visit more had been accomplished for the promotion of cordial relationships between the United States and the Republic of Chile than 40 years of diplomacy had accomplished.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is for services rendered to the Republic of Chile?

Mr. THATCHER. No; it is just an evidence of the good will evinced by the Chilean Government for the officers of the Pacific Fleet and our own Government.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. We have just passed three bills of a similar nature, and this is the same kind of a bill.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I was just wondering what services had been rendered in order to warrant the issuance of the order Al Mérito.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. We are giving all kinds of medals to-night, so why interfere with this generosity?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Admiral Hugh Rodman and Rear Admiral J. L. Jayne, officers of the United States Navy, both retired, and Mrs. Nathan C. Twining, widow of Rear Admiral Nathan C. Twining, deceased, be, and each of them is, hereby authorized to accept from the Republic of Chile the order Al Mérito, first class, conferred on the said Admiral Hugh Rodman and the said Rear Admirals J. L. Jayne and Nathan C. Twining, by the said Republic of Chile in evidence of its appreciation and good will upon the visit, in 1921, to that country of the Pacific Fleet of the United States, the said officers being then and there with said fleet and of the respective ranks hereinbefore indicated.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. That Dr. William S. Thayer and Dr. William H. Welch, citizens of the United States, be, and each of them is, hereby authorized to accept from the Republic of France the decoration of the French Legion of Honor, heretofore conferred, and the certificate of award in relation thereto."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

FRANK H. WILSON

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16192) to amend the naval record of Frank H. Wilson, alias Henry Wencel.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2700 will be substituted for the House bill, being an identical bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and laws conferring rights and privileges upon persons honorably discharged from the United States Navy, Frank H. Wilson, alias Henry Wencel, seaman, United States Navy, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the United States Navy on August 14, 1885, but no pension, pay, nor bounty shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

House bill 16192 was laid on the table.

OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16500) for the relief of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is another bill seeking to get around the decisions of the Comptroller of the United States, whom the Congress has appointed, to require money to be paid only according to law. I am one of those who wants to protect the Comptroller General of the United States in the splendid work he is doing, and I object.

ROSWELL H. BANCROFT

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 5415) for the relief of Roswell H. Bancroft.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman going to let this \$15,000 bill go by?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows this is necessary in case of a burglary over \$10,000. In order to adjust the books they must come to Congress, and that is all this is.

Mr. BLANTON. There is just one kind of bill introduced by my friend from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] I will object to, and that is when he seeks to interfere with our guides here. I am going to let this bill go by.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Roswell H. Bancroft, postmaster at Palisades, Colo., in the sum of \$15,188.91 due to the United States on account of postal funds, postage stamps, and war-tax revenue stamps which were lost as a result of burglary on the night of August 2, 1924.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CHARLES ROBERT O'LEARY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15215) for the relief of Paymaster Charles Robert O'Leary, United States Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter Paymaster Charles Robert O'Leary, United States Navy, shall be regarded as having been promoted to a pay inspector in the United States Navy on the 11th day of January, 1918, with rank as such immediately after Pay Inspector Herbert Elliott Stevens, United States Navy: *Provided,* That said Paymaster Charles Robert O'Leary shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, by examination, his mental, moral, physical, and professional qualifications to perform all the duties of said grade: *Provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle Paymaster Charles Robert O'Leary, United States Navy, to any back pay, allowance, or other emoluments in this permanent rank.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 6, after the figures "1918," strike out the comma, insert a colon, and strike out all the remaining language in that line and all of line 7.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

MARIA J. M'SHANE

The next business on the private calendar was the bill (H. R. 15990) granting six months' pay to Maria J. McShane.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a rule or regulation that pays to the dependents of a man enlisted in the Army or Navy six months' pay at his death. In this case the payment is to this man's mother. There is no objection to it at all, but I want to call attention to a great injustice that has been done to the dependents of our deceased colleague, Mr. Thomas, of Kentucky. There never has been a case where a Member of Congress has died but what the annual salary has been paid to his wife, or to his children, or to his mother and father, if he has not any children. Our colleague from Kentucky has no wife surviving him, but he had two daughters. I can not understand why the Committee on Appropriations has not embraced this amount in the deficiency bill that is to come up to-morrow.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to state to my friend from Texas that he not only left two daughters but an afflicted son. His son is deaf and dumb, and an amendment is going to be offered to-morrow to the deficiency bill, and it ought to go into that bill. I believe the House is going to sustain the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] when he offers the amendment to-morrow.

Mr. BLANTON. I just wanted to let my colleagues know about the matter. It is going to come up to-morrow, and it will be the rankest kind of injustice if this man's two daughters are denied this money.

Mr. ROMJUE. And the son, too.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but especially the daughters. The son, even though he is afflicted, can manage in some way, but the two girls need this money.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield, although I do not want to take up too much time.

Mr. ROMJUE. I submit that a man who is deaf and dumb is very unfortunate.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and we should see that this amendment goes into the bill to-morrow.

Mr. HUDSPETH. If the gentleman will be here and help us to-morrow, we will put the amendment in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I will be here.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to pay Maria J. McShane, dependent mother of the late Ensign Julian J. McShane, United States Navy, an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate said Julian J. McShane was receiving at the date of his death.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of the appropriation 'Pay of the Navy, 1927,' to Maria J. McShane, dependent mother of the late Ensign Julian J. McShane, United States Navy, who was drowned at Wilmington, Calif., on

October 9, 1926, an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate said Julian J. McShane was entitled to receive at the date of his death."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

J. F. NICHOLS

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16828) for the relief of J. F. Nichols.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$200 be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of refunding to J. F. Nichols the said sum paid in excess as a fine to the clerk of the United States district court at Tulsa, Okla., in the case of the United States v. John Nichols, No. 463.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed, read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN CRONIN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2085) to correct the naval record of John Cronin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John Cronin, formerly seaman, United States Navy, be, and he is hereby, relieved of all disabilities attendant upon the dishonorable discharge received by him pursuant to sentence of general court-martial, March 18, 1899, and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to review the naval record of the said John Cronin and grant him an honorable discharge: *Provided,* That no back pension, allowance, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That in the administration of the pension law and laws conferring rights and privileges upon honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, etc., their widows and dependent relatives, John Cronin, formerly seaman, United States Navy, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the United States Navy, March 18, 1889: *Provided,* That no back pension, allowance, or other emoluments shall accrue prior to the passage of this act."

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out the usual rule of Congress in passing bills of this kind. This man Cronin was court-martialed and given a dishonorable discharge from the Navy. Now, it is not infrequent that, where the conduct of the discharged sailor or soldier has been meritorious, that Congress passes a law that he shall be held to have been honorably discharged for the purpose of the pension laws. This bill as reported from the Senate would require the Secretary of the Navy to go back and issue an honorable discharge. That is very unusual and has not been done in any case that I know of in other cases of this kind. I do not think we ought to set a precedent requiring the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War to make a falsification of the record. There is no allegation that the court-martial made a mistake and no allegation that he was dishonorably discharged through any error. The only reason now of having it done at this late day is to remove the stigma from his record so as to permit him to enjoy the privileges of the pension laws.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will indulge me a brief moment to state that this whole matter was considered very carefully by the Committee on Naval Affairs. Extensive and lengthy hearings were held upon it, and it is the purpose to relieve this man of a dishonorable discharge because he had an unusual record in the Army both prior to and during the period in which he was dishonorably discharged. After receiving the dishonorable discharge this man

served in the late war while employed as a seaman in the merchant marine in the transportation of ammunition and supplies to the allies from New York to Liverpool. He hazarded his life not only upon one, but upon many occasions, and I hope the gentleman from Texas will not insist upon his amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas is in accordance with the usual disposition of these bills. This bill provides that he shall be granted an honorable discharge. The custom has been in the past merely to clear his record. Under this bill the Navy Department would have to issue a new discharge, stating that it was honorable. Now, I am inclined to think there is a good deal in the contention of the gentleman from Texas that the purpose of this bill would be to have the record of the Navy changed from a dishonorable discharge to an honorable discharge. The amendment would clear the record of a dishonorable discharge, and that would be satisfactory to the department and the man would get the benefit of the pension laws. So I think there is no harm in adopting the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman surely would not deprive this man of an honorable discharge?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, not at all. He will get a pension from now on. It is all right.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I am glad to have had the explanation of the gentleman, and I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

KENNETH M. ORR

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10290) for the relief of Kenneth M. Orr.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from California why it is that we do not get a report from the Navy on this bill?

Mr. LINEBERGER. We have a report.

Mr. BLANTON. But it is not in the committee report.

Mr. LINEBERGER. It is not, but it was considered by the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Why is it not in the committee report?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I do not know. The gentleman knows that sometimes these things do not get into the committee report.

Mr. BLANTON. And sometimes they do not look good.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the Navy Department is against the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to see what the Navy Department has to say about it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would too, and so I suggest to the gentlemen that when he runs across a bill of this kind he call up the committee, and he then might be able to get the report.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to object to the bill, but he ought to get the report from the department, from the committee.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I assure the gentleman that I will have it in there the next time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TOLLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. TOLLEY. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I trust the gentleman from New York will state on what ground he objects.

Mr. TOLLEY. I object upon the ground that there is no report submitted from the Navy Department.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from California, [Mr. LINEBERGER], who is the author of the bill, in preparing his report probably inadvertently failed to include it. As a matter of fact the Navy Department reported adversely to the favorable consideration of this bill. I do not think the gentleman should hold his objection against the method of reporting the bill. Hereafter I am satisfied the gentleman will include it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did I understand the gentleman to say that the Navy Department has reported against the favorable consideration of this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Knowing the character of the bill, to remove a dishonorable record against some enlisted man, the Navy Department, I know, always objects to every one of them.

Mr. LINEBERGER. This boy is only 17 years old.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Navy Department always objects—

Mr. BLANTON. Unless it is an officer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the compensation laws and laws conferring rights and privileges upon honorable discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, etc., their widows and dependent relatives, Kenneth M. Orr shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the United States Navy as a fireman, first class, November 20, 1922.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

E. C. CALLAHAN

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 615, H. R. 11399, authorizing the President to reappoint E. C. Callahan, formerly captain of Infantry, United States Army, a captain of Infantry United States Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to return to Calendar 615, H. R. 11399. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to reappoint E. C. Callahan, formerly a captain of Infantry, United States Army, a captain of Infantry, United States Army, in accordance with the provisions of the national defense act, of June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to reappoint E. C. Callahan, formerly an officer in the Infantry, United States Army, an officer in the Infantry, United States Army, in the grade and in the position on the promotion list provided by the next to last paragraph of section 24a of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended by the act of June 4, 1920: *Provided*, That said E. C. Callahan shall not by the passage of this act be entitled to any back pay or allowances of any kind: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall operate to increase the number of officers in the Regular Army now authorized by law."

The committee amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING THE NAVAL SERVICE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15439) providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill will retain its place on the calendar if there is objection made to its consideration.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that it be passed without prejudice.

Mr. ARENTZ. Surely the gentleman has no objection to paying these officers who suffered loss due to exchange rates in foreign countries.

Mr. BLANTON. For instance, here is one to pay Frederick G. Pyne \$1,000, and there is another to pay the Pace Institute of New York \$833.50.

Mr. ARENTZ. Of course, that is a different matter.

Mr. BLANTON. It is all in one blanket bill. The Comptroller General of the United States, whom the gentleman

helped to create, has turned these claims down. If I have to, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

OWNER OF STEAMER "SQUANTUM"

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12623) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Squantum*.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the owner of the steamer *Squantum* against the United States of America for damage and loss alleged to have been caused by collision between said vessel and the U. S. steam lighter *Thomas H. Timmins* on the anchorage ground off Bedloe Island, in the harbor of New York, on the 27th day of January, 1919, may be sued for by said owner in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing said court, and such court shall have such jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States of America in favor of the owner of the said steamer *Squantum*, or against the owner of the said steamer *Squantum* in favor of the United States of America upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "appeals" insert "except that no interest shall be allowed on any claim."

The committee amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

OWNER OF SCOW "65H"

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12625) for the relief of the owner of scow 65H.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the owner of scow known as 65H, arising out of damage and loss sustained by said scow while berthed in the harbor of New York, against the United States of America for damage and loss alleged to have been caused by suction and swells created by the United States ship *Broome* (destroyer 210), while said vessel was passing through Long Island Sound and the East River on December 11, 1919, may be sued for by said owner in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty, and acting under the rules governing said court, and such court shall have such jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States of America in favor of the owner of the said scow 65H, or against the owner of the said scow 65H, in favor of the United States of America upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "appeal," insert the words "except that no interest shall be allowed on any claim."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

S. K. TRUBY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15181) for the relief of S. K. Truby.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem one United States Treasury certificate of indebtedness, payable to bearer, No. 8693, in the denomination of \$500, series TS-1921, dated September 15, 1920, and matured September 15, 1921, with interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from September 15, 1920, to September 15, 1921, in favor of S. K. Truby, Maple Park, Ill., without presentation of the said certificate, the certificate of indebtedness having been lost, stolen, or destroyed: *Provided*, That the said certificate of indebtedness shall not have been previously presented for payment and that no payment shall be made hereunder for any coupons which shall have been previously presented and paid: *Provided further*, That the said S. K. Truby shall first file in the Treasury Department a bond in the penal sum of double the amount of the principal of said Treasury certificate of indebtedness, and the interest payable thereon, in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the lost, stolen, or destroyed certificate of indebtedness herein described.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS SWEENEY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15867) for the relief of Francis Sweeney.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Francis Sweeney, formerly an employee in the Bureau of Lighthouses, Department of Commerce, to wit, a seaman on the United States lightship No. 58, the sum of \$80, the same being in full payment for losses suffered by the said Francis Sweeney by loss of personal property used and reasonably necessary in connection with his official duty on said lightship, which was sunk on December 11, 1905.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

OWNERS OF FERRYBOAT "OREGON"

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 111) for the relief of the owners of the ferryboat *Oregon*.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the owners of the ferryboat *Oregon* against the United States of America for damages alleged to have been caused by collision between the U. S. S. *Canby* and said ferryboat *Oregon* in the East River, at New York, N. Y., on or about the 24th day of February, 1916, may be sued for by the said owners of the ferryboat *Oregon* in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court, and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the owners of the said ferryboat *Oregon*, or against the owners of said ferryboat *Oregon*, in favor of the United States, upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties and with the same rights of appeal, except that no interest shall be allowed on any claim: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months from the date of the passage of this act.

Committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "appeal," insert the words "except that no interest shall be allowed on any claim."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH W. KIEFFER

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 244) for the relief of Elizabeth W. Kieffer.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Elizabeth W. Kieffer, postmaster at Fort Russell, Wyo., in the sum of \$1,508.60, due to the United States on account of loss by theft of post-office funds by Claude E. Davis, on November 14, 1922; and the sum of \$1,508.60 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of this claim.

Committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,508.60" and insert in lieu thereof "\$568.31."

Page 1, line 8, after the figures "1922" strike out the remainder of lines 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

OWNER OF THE STEAMSHIP "NEPTUNE"

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 115) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Neptune*.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the owner of the steamship *Neptune* against the United States of America for damages alleged to have been caused by collision between said vessel and the United States steamship *Eagle*, formerly known as the *Peerless*, on the 24th day of October, 1917, at a bulkhead in Gowanus Canal, near the foot of Smith Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., may be sued for by the said owner of the steamship *Neptune* in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court, and the said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the owner of the said steamship *Neptune*, or against the owner of said steamship *Neptune* in favor of the United States, upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties, and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

Committee amendment:

Page 10, after the word "appeal," insert the words "except that no interest shall be allowed on any claim."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

J. W. NEIL

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 179) for the relief of J. W. Neil.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. W. Neil, of Ogden, Utah, the sum of \$7,947.53 as compensation for and in full satisfaction of any claim such J. W. Neil may have for losses suffered by reason of the libel of a carload of sugar belonging to him on May 21, 1920, by a United States marshal under color of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,947.53" and insert "\$7,697.53."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The Senate bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

AUGUST MICHALCHUK

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 521) for the relief of August Michalchuk.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to August Michalchuk as guardian of his infant daughter, Lizzie Michalchuk, the sum of \$3,000 for injuries sustained by his daughter, Lizzie, an infant now about 6½ years old, who without negligence on her part or on the part of her parents, was run over, July 4, 1920, by a United States mail truck No. 2290, in charge of Joseph Tembone, causing a compound fracture of the left leg and severe lacerations of the forehead, with bruises and contusions covering the left side of her body. Said payment to be taken in full and final settlement of any claim against the United States by both the said August Michalchuk and Lizzie Michalchuk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out, on line 7, page 1, "\$3,000" and insert "\$2,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of Texas: Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$2,000."

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the only purpose of this amendment is to make the bill conform to what I think is the general practice of the Committee on Claims in cases of this kind. This girl had a leg broken, but there is no evidence to show but that there has been a complete mending of the injury; no shortening of the limb, and no impediment of the limb. I doubt if in other cases we have allowed more than \$2,000. I would like to get the views of the chairman.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I think the gentleman is correct, so far as the general policy of the committee is concerned. The usual amount has been \$2,000. I confess I do not know why \$3,000 was allowed.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I have no objection, but my amendment was to make it conform to the general practice.

Mr. BULWINKLE. There was an additional injury. The doctors do not know at this time whether her mental condition is permanently impaired or not.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. If the gentleman can assure us there are other injuries than those named in the report, I shall withdraw my amendment.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I can.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ODELON RAMOS

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2594) for the relief of Odelon Ramos.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. With the understanding that the amendment is adopted, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the bill and amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Odelon Ramos the sum of \$5,000, as compensation for the death of his son, Jose Maria Ramos, a minor, who was killed in Bexar County, Tex., on June 5, 1924, when two United States Army airplanes collided.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Line 6, strike out "\$5,000 as compensation" and insert "\$2,000 in full settlement against the Government."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill as amended.

The Senate bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was ordered to be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

HARRY CADEN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13157) to allow credits in the accounts of Harry Caden, special fiscal agent, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that seems to be an attempt to get around the decisions of the Comptroller General. There is no report whatever on the bill from the Comptroller General. Unless there is a report from the Comptroller General accompanying all bills of this kind, showing that they are not intended to enable these people to get around the decisions of the Comptroller General, I shall object to all of them. The Comptroller General must have some good reason for objecting to the payment of these accounts.

Mr. UNDERHILL. This is a departmental bill, and the Comptroller General has no connection whatever with it.

Mr. BLANTON. These bills are all designed to change the generality of his decisions. I would like to see what the Comptroller General has to say about it. If the gentleman from Massachusetts had investigated the activities of the department of the Comptroller General, as I have, he would know that they are doing a good work down there.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. If there is no objection to my withholding it, I will.

Mr. VAILE. This is simply a question between attorneys of different departments. I might say to the gentleman that since 1908 the fiscal agents of the Reclamation Service upon the direction of the Secretary of the Interior have allowed certain—

Mr. BLANTON. I think I can arrive at an agreement with the gentleman. We are going to have another night on the Private Calendar in a day or two, and in the meantime I will get a report from the Comptroller General on this proposition, and unless he has some serious grounds for turning this down I shall waive my objection.

Mr. VAILE. I assume the Comptroller General would adhere to his previous policy of disapproving this and other claims.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state this to the gentleman from Colorado: Whenever the Comptroller General turns down an account and a special bill is brought in to get around his objection, which this does, or to allow it in spite of his objection, I think the gentleman owes it to the Congress, who repre-

sents the people and the Public Treasury, to get a report from the Comptroller General of the United States on that proposition.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. The gentleman from Massachusetts says the Comptroller General has no objection to it at all.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts can not speak for the Comptroller General on this until he gets word from him.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The "gentleman from Massachusetts" will say to the gentleman from Texas that he is absolutely correct and if the committee has been neglectful in not bringing in any report from the Comptroller General, then the bill should be objected to.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has the finest judgment in the world.

Mr. VAILE. Do I understand the gentleman still objects?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I must object.

FRED A. KNAUF

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15807), for the relief of Fred A. Knauf.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to allow credit to a postmaster in Wisconsin of \$141,000. If that is the kind of a claim we ought to try out here in a half minute, I do not want to be a party to it. I object.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment until I repeat to him once more that all accounts which are burglary accounts under \$10,000 can be settled under the law by the Post Office Department, but when a burglary occurs and the amount exceeds \$10,000 by \$1 the law requires that they must come to Congress in order to adjust the bookkeeping of the department.

Mr. BLANTON. How many people live in this town in Wisconsin?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I do not know how many people live in this town.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a small town, is it not?

Mr. VOIGT. If the gentleman will permit, it is a town of 40,000 people.

Mr. BLANTON. How much money is a postmaster in a town of 40,000 people supposed to keep?

Mr. VOIGT. If the gentleman will look at the bill he will see that all of the funds here, with the exception of \$107, were in postage stamps.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, for a town of only 40,000 people, it occurs to me \$141,000 in postage stamps is a pretty big stamp account.

Mr. UNDERHILL. But this office supplies the whole region around about.

Mr. VOIGT. It supplies the surrounding country with postage stamps.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not like to object to a thing like this, but it occurs to me this is a very large amount.

Mr. VOIGT. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that this claim has been investigated by a dozen officials and they have all reported that the postmaster there complied with every rule and regulation.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman acquainted with this postmaster?

Mr. VOIGT. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does he know he is a man of integrity?

Mr. VOIGT. Absolutely.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Fred A. Knauf, postmaster at Sheboygan, Wis., in the sum of \$141,433.82 (said sum consisting of \$107 cash, \$76,703.62 salable postage stamps, \$64,575.20 precanceled stamps, one war-savings stamp of the value of \$5, and war-tax revenue funds to the amount of \$43), on account of money, war-savings stamp, and postage stamps stolen from safes in the post office at said city when burglarized on October 17, 1925.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LILLIE F. EVANS

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill S. 1818) for the relief of Lillie F. Evans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CLIFFORD J. SANGHOVE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15855) for the relief of Clifford J. Sanghove.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object because there is no report from the Comptroller General on this bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman from Texas withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. I withhold it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There is a report dated February 17, 1927.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there a report from the Comptroller General? It is not in the committee report.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have the report here.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the Comptroller General recommend that this be paid?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. He does.

Mr. BLANTON. Why did not the gentleman put that statement in the committee report?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know about that. I have a copy of the report here which came in late.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman states that there is a report on this bill from the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. McCarl, and that he recommends the passage of the bill?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It is report No. 152, dated February 17, 1927. This is a very meritorious case.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman says that General McCarl recommends the passage of the bill?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The Comptroller General does not object to the passage of the bill due to the meritorious features of it.

Mr. BLANTON. The Comptroller General agrees that it be passed?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. He does not object to it in any way at all and I trust the gentleman from Texas will not object.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the jurisdiction of the Committee on Naval Affairs. The reason I make it is that the Committee on Naval Affairs in several instances has taken jurisdiction of purely private claims and I think this is one of them.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I think it is time we raise the question of jurisdiction, so that the Committee on Naval Affairs will confine itself to the matters properly committed to the jurisdiction of that committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state it appears from the record upon the bill itself that this bill on January 4, 1927, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed. Thereafter, on January 6, 1927, the Committee on Claims was discharged and the bill referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Apparently, this was by action of the House.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been reported out of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General approves the bill, and I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the Manual contains this language:

In cases wherein the House itself refers a private bill, a point of order may not be raised as to jurisdiction.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order as to jurisdiction.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to cancel the claim of the United States against Clifford J. Sanghove, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve Force, retired, in the sum of \$1,067.46, erroneously paid to him through error in the General Accounting Office.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILFORD W. CALDWELL

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16706) for the relief of Wilford W. Caldwell.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue a patent under the homestead entry of Wilford W. Caldwell for the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 35 and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 36 in township 1 south of range 1 east, Uintah meridian, Utah, upon compliance by said Wilford W. Caldwell with the homestead laws of the United States: *Provided, however,* That in addition to the usual fees and commissions payable under existing laws said entryman shall pay the sum of \$1.25 per acre for the land so entered, which latter sum shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and disposed of in the same manner as other proceeds derived from the sale of lands within the former Uintah Indian Reservation, Utah.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. PATRICK H. BODKIN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 1661) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mrs. Patrick H. Bodkin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That within six months from the date of the passage of this act a petition may be filed with the Court of Claims by or on behalf of Mrs. Patrick H. Bodkin, of Blythe, Riverside County, Calif., for a hearing of a claim for reimbursement for all loss, liability, damage, and expense incurred by her in any manner in connection with a quarter section of land described as northeast quarter section 11, township 7 south, range 22 east, San Bernardino meridian, in the State of California, for which land she had been issued a patent, and which she now holds as trustee for William B. Edwards in accordance with the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Bodkin v. Edwards* (205 U. S. p. 221), and the Court of Claims is given jurisdiction to hear and determine such claim.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "all loss, liability, damage, and expense incurred by her in any manner in connection with a" and substitute in place thereof the following: "the value of the following-described land, exclusive of improvements, as of February 28, 1921, to wit, that certain".

Page 1, line 11, strike out "she" and insert "her husband, Patrick H. Bodkin, deceased".

Page 2, line 6, add the following: "*Provided, That in considering the case the Court of Claims shall determine the value of the land in question at the date of judgment by the court adverse to Patrick H. Bodkin, also determine the value of the soldier's additional scrip, and deduct the latter from any awards made to the claimant.*"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NICK MASONICH

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2348) for the relief of Nick Masonich.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of \$5,000 to Nick Masonich, of Butte, Mont., who was disabled by personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty as a member of a station gang employed by the Alaskan Engineering Commission."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES E. MOYER

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8443) for the relief of James E. Moyer.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, James E. Moyer, who was a member of Company H, Second Regiment United States Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the 15th day of November, 1902: *Provided, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH F. RITCHERDSON

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14708) for the relief of Joseph F. Ritcherdsen.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

That all after the enacting clause be stricken out and the following inserted:

"That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers or their dependents, Joseph F. Ritcherdsen shall hereafter be held and considered to have been in the military service of the United States as a musician of Company C, One hundred and twenty-second Illinois Infantry Volunteers, from the 4th day of September, 1862, to the 1st day of June, 1864, and to have been discharged honorably from said service on the last-named date: *Provided, That no bounty, pension, pay, or other emoluments shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.*"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KATHERINE IMBRIE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the resolution (S. J. Res. 112) for the relief of Katherine Imbrie.

The Clerk read the title to the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this claim ought not to go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that it is a claim against the Government of the United States, and that the Committee on Claims has proper jurisdiction over it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. There has been more or less controversy as to where it should go, but owing to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs had all the papers, had gone through all the evidence, conducted the previous hearings and managed this affair from the beginning, the Committee on Claims felt that in justification to the claimant and to the Government that they should have the advantage of the knowledge that the Committee on Foreign Affairs had, and therefore refused to take jurisdiction of it.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The other bill, the House bill, referring somewhat to the same subject, related to the expenditure of \$110,000 that the Federal Government had collected from the Persian Government, and it undertook to make certain disposition of the \$110,000. This is an entirely different bill. This is simply a claim for the relief of Mrs. Imbrie. It looks to me as if it was the same kind of a claim that the Committee on Claims is constantly considering.

Mr. UNDERHILL. As a matter of fact, this takes no money out of the Treasury of the United States. It takes it out of the \$110,000 and leaves the balance of the money in the Treasury.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The gentleman is mistaken; the bill provides that there shall be paid to Mrs. Imbrie, out of the Treasury of the United States, \$30,000. It has no connection whatever with the \$110,000 which has been paid by the Persian Government to reimburse us for the expense of the war vessel we sent over there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that the joint resolution is improperly referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Yes; that the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not have jurisdiction.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to question the gentleman from Texas for a moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Texas must remember that \$110,000 was paid into the Treasury of the United States by the Persian Government, and if \$30,000 is taken from the Treasury for Mrs. Imbrie there still will be a balance left. It is the money which came from the Persian Government from the most atrocious assault upon an official of the United States Government in the history of this Republic.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman let me read this letter from the Secretary of State. It says:

The Persian Government on July 29, 1924, agreed to these demands in full. It promptly paid the indemnity of \$60,000 which this Government demanded for Mrs. Imbrie, this total having been fixed after a very careful examination of precedents consistently followed by this Government. This sum was paid over to Mrs. Imbrie on November 24, 1924. The Persian Government also paid \$3,000 to Seymour for injuries he received at the time of the attack.

All of that \$60,000 has been paid to Mrs. Imbrie, and, according to the letter of the Secretary of State that amount was consistent with the usual policy of the Government of the United States, and all of the precedents.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to correct him right there?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is usually a very thorough student of reports and a careful examiner of testimony, but he forgets one of the vital pieces of testimony in this particular case. That \$60,000 was agreed upon while Mrs. Imbrie was coming back after the murder.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. With the body of her husband.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. With the body of her husband, alone, on a battleship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The State Department, when it agreed to accept \$60,000 and turn it over to Mrs. Imbrie, knew nothing whatever about the atrocious assault committed upon her four days after the murder of her husband.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. And the loss of her child.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes. That assault upon her was committed in a public street in the central part of the city of Tehran. While sitting in an automobile she was seized by the throat by two young men and spat upon, an outrage which resulted in the loss of her child. Our Government did not wait until Mrs. Imbrie had arrived here to learn the facts about the murder, and the subsequent assault upon her, before making a settlement. The sum mentioned in this bill is to be paid to her in compensation for the injury which she herself suffered although it will far from compensate her. She ought to have received the whole \$110,000. I hope the gentleman from Texas will not object to a claim like this.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not object if I did not feel that the Government had paid \$60,000, all that it collected from the Persian Government for this purpose. It collected \$110,000 for the expense of the war vessel that it sent over there.

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; that was for the education of the Persian students.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will read from the report:

Subsequent to the action taken by the Persian authorities in satisfying fully the first, third, fourth, and fifth demands stated above, it was suggested to the Persian Government that the undertaking of that Government with respect to the second demand, viz, the payment of the cost of dispatching the *Trenton* to Persia, the amount of which by then had been ascertained to be \$110,000, might be carried out by the establishment of a trust fund to be utilized in the education of Persian students, etc.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The Government collected the \$110,000 to reimburse itself for actual expenditures in sending the *Trenton* over to Persia to bring back the body.

Mr. UNDERHILL. A question is raised here as to jurisdiction. There is no doubt that the gentleman's point of order is absolutely sound if he insists upon a ruling; but if he does, all of this work will go for naught, and Mrs. Imbrie will be deprived of her money.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I insist upon a ruling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired. The gentleman from Texas raises the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let the Chair state the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] makes the point of order that the Committee on Foreign Affairs was without jurisdiction to consider the pending bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear first from the gentleman from Maryland, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, the original bill to which the gentleman refers was to appropriate out of the \$110,000 which came from the Persian Government—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to hear from the gentleman on the question of the point of order, and the Chair directs the attention of the gentleman to the following rule of the House, Rule XXI, section 3:

No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following committees, viz: To the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to the Committee on Pensions, to the Committee on Claims, to the Committee on War Claims, to the Committee on the Public Lands, and to the Committee on Accounts.

Has the gentleman any argument to make upon that rule?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think that unanimous consent was obtained at the time. The point I want to make is this: When this bill was introduced it was to pay the money out of the \$110,000 which was paid into the Treasury of the United States by the Persian Government. The bill was then amended, and when it came over here, having all the facts before the Foreign Affairs Committee, the chairman of the Claims Committee and the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee agreed that there should be unanimous consent obtained and the bill sent to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is my recollection that when Speaker LONGWORTH made this statement—and he made it to the House—that there had been some controversy as to where the bill should be referred; after consulting with the chairmen of both committees, he stated that by unanimous consent, unless there was objection, it would be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the bill be passed over temporarily while the record may be ascertained.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair permit me for a moment or two to call his attention to a lot of decisions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In support of the rule?

Mr. BLANTON. In support of the various rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not need any argument to support a rule of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me present this feature of the case. If this were a private bill there would be no question but what the rule would apply. This is not an ordinary private bill. What is a private bill? It is one in which certain individuals only are interested. This bill is one in which the whole people of the United States are interested, because it affects one of our diplomatic officers in a foreign country and his heirs. It is a bill in which every person in the United States is interested in seeing that a proper adjustment is made for all the wrongs this good woman has suffered. This is not a regular private bill. In my judgment, if I were in the Chair I would hold it in order subject to the rules that where a public bill has been submitted to a wrong committee and that committee brings in a report, every other committee loses the right to question its jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will say if it were a public bill it would not be considered at this time at all.

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] realizes that Mrs. Imbrie had been also injured—

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I wish the lady from Massachusetts would address the Chair on the point of order. I have made my point of order, and it will not be withdrawn.

Mrs. ROGERS. I will address my remarks to the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to know whether it is agreeable to have the bill passed over temporarily in order to ascertain the record and know whether as a matter of fact the Speaker of the House by unanimous consent referred the bill.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I will be very glad to have the Chair pass the bill over until he can have time to examine the record connected with the bill's reference to the proper committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a question of fact. The bill will be passed over temporarily, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

CARL J. REID DUSSOME

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15410) authorizing the enrollment of Carl J. Reid Dussome as a Kiowa Indian, and directing issuance of trust patents to him to certain lands of the Kiowa Indian Reservation, Okla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill deals with a tract of land in my home county. I have never heard of it before, and I would like to know something about the legislation, why it has been introduced, and why I was not consulted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if objection is going to be made in order to save time.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I would like to know if the gentleman has consulted members of the Indian Tribe who are supposed to own this land? No notice has been brought to me about the merits of this legislation, and I would not have known it was here had I not read the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will reserve his objection for a moment I will make a statement.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I will reserve it.

Mr. THOMAS. This Indian is a northern Indian. He came to Oklahoma and married into the Kiowa Tribe, and thereupon he was admitted to the tribe. He made application for an allotment. The Indian agent recommended favorably on the allotment. The Indian Bureau Commissioner recommended favorably, and it went before the Indian Affairs Committee of the House and they reported favorably.

The Indian lives in my district and the land happens to be in Mr. McCLINTIC's district. The land belongs to the Indians. That is about the statement with relation to the affair.

Mr. HASTINGS. If my colleague will permit, I made this report. I did not know the land was in my colleague's district. My colleague [Mr. THOMAS] appeared before the committee, and the statement made there was similar to the statement he makes here to-night. That is why the favorable report was made.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROMJUE. I want to know whether any other gentleman from Oklahoma has had anything to do with this legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is land that belongs to the Kiowa Indian Tribe and I have no recommendation from any member of that tribe, I shall be forced to object.

FRANK A. GRAB

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15182), granting six months' pay to Frank A. Grab, father of Alfred Newton Grab, deceased seaman, United States Navy, in active service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to pay to Frank A. Grab, father of Alfred Newton Grab, deceased seaman, United States Navy, who was killed in line of duty on February 7, 1922, at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, an amount equal to six months' pay, at the rate said Alfred Newton Grab was receiving at the date of his death.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of current appropriations 'Pay of the Navy, 1927,' to Frank A. Grab, father of Alfred Newton Grab, deceased seaman, United States Navy, who was killed in line of duty on February

7, 1922, at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate said Alfred Newton Grab was receiving at the date of his death."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ROBERT F. NEELEY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16336) for the relief of Robert F. Neeley and Franklin E. Neeley.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by appropriate quitclaim deed to Robert F. Neeley, his heirs and assigns, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the easement for the Lawrence Canal over the southeast quarter of section 11, township 22 north, range 58 west of the sixth principal meridian, and to Franklin E. Neeley, his heirs and assigns, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the easement for the Lawrence Canal over the southwest quarter of section 12 of the same township and range, the Lawrence Canal having been abandoned and the easements over such lands being no longer required by the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Neeley," strike out the words "his heirs and assigns" and insert "and Franklin E. Neeley, their heirs and assigns."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "meridian," insert the word "Nebraska."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MARY M. JONES

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5622) for the relief of Mary M. Jones.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Mary M. Jones, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,950, in compensation for damages caused and sustained to property in Linn County, Oreg., such loss being caused by fire set from burning material from an Army airplane on or about July 1, 1924, the said airplane being in fire-control service under the direction of the Forest Service.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "appropriated," insert the words "in full settlement against the Government."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$1,950" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,035."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JOHN J. CORCORAN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5662) for the relief of John J. Corcoran.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John J. Corcoran, 26 Dent Street, Roxbury, Mass., the sum of \$600 for damages to his automobile, medical expenses, ruined clothing, and incidental expenses when his automobile was struck by ambulance No. 987 of the United States Veterans' Bureau on the 18th day of September, 1922, in Boston, Mass.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, after the words "out of" insert the word "any."

On page 1, line 6, after the word "Massachusetts" insert the words "in full settlement against the Government."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "incidental expenses" and insert the words "permanent injuries sustained by the wife of said John J. Corcoran."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

D. GEORGE SHORTEN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7852) for the relief of D. George Shorten.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to D. George Shorten, late postmaster at Storrs, Utah, the sum of \$95.06, this being the amount stolen by a burglar on March 30, 1922, through no fault of the said D. George Shorten, and the sum of \$95.06 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of this claim.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to D. George Shorten, late postmaster at Storrs, Utah, the sum of \$95.06, being the amount stolen by a burglar on March 30, 1922."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PRESS PUBLISHING CO.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11727) for the relief of the Press Publishing Co., Marianna, Ark.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized notwithstanding the provisions of section 3828, Revised Statutes, to adjust and settle the claim of the Press Publishing Co., of Marianna, Ark., in the amount of \$9, for publication of advertisements inviting proposals for sundry work at Marianna, Ark., post office, during July and November, 1924, and January, 1925, and to certify same for payment from the appropriation "General expenses of public buildings, 1925."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK, SAVANNA, ILL.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16311) for the relief of the First National Bank, Savanna, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem, in favor of the First National Bank, Savanna, Ill., United States Treasury note No. 56663 in the denomination of \$1,000, series C-1925, issued December 15, 1922, matured June 15, 1925, with interest from the date of issue to the date of maturity, at the rate of 4½ per cent per annum, without presentation of said note, the said note, together with coupons due June 15, 1923, to June 15, 1925, inclusive, attached, having been lost, stolen, destroyed: *Provided*, That the said note shall not have been previously presented and paid, and that payment shall not be made hereunder for any coupons which shall have been previously presented and paid: *And provided further*, That the said First Na-

tional Bank, Savanna, Ill., shall first file in the Treasury Department a bond in the penal sum of double the amount of the principal of the said note and the unpaid interest which had accrued thereon when the principal became due and payable, in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury, with condition to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the Treasury note or the coupons thereof hereinbefore described.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

STEAMSHIP "GAELIC PRINCE"

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 118) for the relief of all owners of cargo aboard the steamship *Gaelic Prince* at the time of her collision with the U. S. S. *Antigone*.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claims of all owners of various shipments of merchandise which were laden on board of the steamship *Gaelic Prince*, at the time hereinafter mentioned, against the United States of America for damages alleged to have been caused by collision between the said vessel and the U. S. S. *Antigone*, formerly known as steamship *Neckar*, on the 9th day of October, 1919, near buoy 10, in Ambrose Channel, in the harbor of New York, may be sued for by the said owners of cargo in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court, and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suits and to enter judgments or decrees for the amounts of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the owners of said cargo, or against the owners of said cargo in favor of the United States, upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties, and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notices of the suits shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by orders of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suits shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "appeal," insert the words "except that no interest shall be allowed on any claim."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SAMUEL S. ARCHER

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 190) for the relief of Samuel S. Archer.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$226 to Samuel S. Archer, for injuries sustained as the result of being struck by a Government-owned automobile on the streets of the city of Plattsmouth, Nebr., on December 13, 1921.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

KATHERINE IMBRIE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ascertained the facts with reference to Calendar No. 738, and suggests that the Clerk again report Senate Joint Resolution 112.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair finds that on February 8, 1927, on page 3311 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, occurs the following proceeding:

The SPEAKER. On February 2 the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 112 for the relief of Katherine Imbrie. The chairman of the Committee on Claims advises the Chair that in view of the fact that

the Committee on Foreign Affairs has had extended hearings on this matter he prefers that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The chairman of the latter committee also agrees to this reference. Therefore without objection the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

There was no objection.

The Chair construes that as the unanimous consent which is required under section 3 of Rule XXI, and therefore overrules the point of order. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 112?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Katherine Imbrie, widow of Vice Consul Robert Whitney Imbrie, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$30,000 as compensation to her for the physical and mental suffering resulting from an attack upon her at Teheran, Persia, on July 22, 1924.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after "1924," insert the words "the acceptance of this sum by Katherine Imbrie shall be in full settlement of all claims or demands for personal injuries suffered by her and for the death of her husband."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to say in behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], who made the point of order, that the gentleman made it conscientiously, believing it to be his duty. He and I did not agree as to what should be done with respect to this bill, but there is not a more honorable, conscientious, hard-working, able, and efficient man in this House than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. The gentleman works hard on every one of these bills that comes up and puts in long hours upon them, with but one purpose in view, and that is to do what is right and just. I know he has the respect and properly deserves the commendation of every Member of this House for the splendid work he does, for he is one of the most valuable men in Congress. [Applause.]

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

C. P. DRYDEN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2094) for the relief of C. P. Dryden.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. P. Dryden, \$2,329.25, as full compensation to C. P. Dryden, Mrs. C. P. Dryden, and Mrs. D. F. Dryden for personal damages and private property damages which occurred, without negligence on his part, as a result of the operation of military aircraft on June 28, 1923, at Kiwanis Aviation Field, Van Nuys, Calif.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FERRYBOAT "NEW YORK"

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 3665) for the relief of the owner of the ferryboat *New York*.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the United States Housing Corporation, owner of the ferryboat *New York*, against the United States of America for damages alleged to have been caused by collision between said vessel and the United States ship *Wasp*, on the 19th day of August, 1919, in the Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Va., may be sued for by the said United States Housing Corporation in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court; and said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine

such suit and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the owner of the said ferryboat *New York*, or against the owner of the said ferryboat *New York* in favor of the United States, with the same powers as if said suits were brought in accordance with the provisions of the suits in admiralty act of March 9, 1920, and said decree or judgment shall be paid as provided in said act: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within four months of the date of the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of line 6, page 2, after the word "States," lines 7 and 8, and the first six words in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof as follows: "Upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties, and with the same rights of appeal, except that no interest shall be allowed on any claim."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SAMUEL J. LEAPHART

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 4841) for the relief of Samuel J. Leaphart.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Samuel J. Leaphart, United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$90.94, representing payments made by him to a number of special deputies for traveling expenses, which payments were disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States, but which were subsequently paid by Samuel J. Leaphart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

STANDARD OIL CO. OF NEW JERSEY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16027) authorizing the Court of Claims to hear and determine questions of law involved in the alleged erroneous collection of tonnage taxes in 1920 and 1921 on three vessels operated by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, under bareboat charter from a Danzig corporation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

GUY CARLTON BAKER

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 17014) to correct the records of the War Department to show that Guy Carlton Baker is one and the same person as Carlton C. Baker is one and the same person.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to amend the records of the War Department to show that Guy Carlton Baker is one and the same person as Carlton C. Baker or Carlton C. Baker, who served in the War of 1812 as a private in Capt. Ezekiel Colburn's company, Lieut. Col. Thomas B. Benedict's regiment, New York Militia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

COMMANDER JULES JAMES, UNITED STATES NAVY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 4683) granting permission to Commander Jules James, United States Navy, to accept the decoration of the Legion of Honor tendered him by the Republic of France.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PAUL R. SUTHERLAND

The next business on the Private Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 295) to waive age of Paul R. Sutherland, United States Army.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the maximum age for entrance into the United States Military Academy be waived in the case of Paul R. Sutherland, a private in the United States Army Air Service, to allow him to obtain appointment from the Army.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the word "Army," add the words "to enter with the class which reports July 1, 1927."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JOHN W. CLEAVINGER, DECEASED

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15633) to correct the military record of John W. Cleavenger, deceased.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, John W. Cleavenger, who was a member of Company B, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 26th day of April, 1862: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

KENNEDY F. FOSTER

The next business on the private calendar was the bill (H. R. 9855) for the relief of Kennedy F. Foster.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of all laws conferring rights, benefits, and privileges upon honorably discharged soldiers, Kennedy F. Foster shall be held and considered as having been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States on November 10, 1864, as a member of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry: *Provided*, That no bounty, pay, or allowances shall be held as having accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CHARLIE R. PATE

The next business on the private calendar was the bill (H. R. 15178) for the relief of Charlie R. Pate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of all laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Charlie R. Pate, who was a member of Company L, Twenty-seventh United States Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on November 30, 1902: *Provided*, That no back pay, bounty, pension, or other allowance shall be held as accrued prior to the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 5, after the word "Pate" insert the words "who was a member of Company L, Twenty-seventh United States Infantry, shall hereafter."

Line 8, after the word "States" insert the words "as a private of that organization."

Line 9, after the figures "1902" insert the words "*Provided*, That no back pay, bounty, pension, or other allowance shall be held as accrued prior to the passage of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM TAYLOR COBURN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14977) for the relief of William Taylor Coburn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, William Taylor Coburn, late a private in Company H, Nineteenth United States Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of said company and regiment: *Provided*, That no bounty, pay, or allowances shall be held as accrued prior to the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 6, strike out the word "nineteenth" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sixteenth."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM MULLINS

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who objected to No. 641 on the Calendar, H. R. 6935, has agreed to withdraw his objection, and I ask unanimous consent to return to that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to return to H. R. 6935, on the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill to correct the military record of William Mullins.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, William Mullins, who served in Company I, Eleventh Regiment, and Company G, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private of Company G, Ninth Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, on September 1, 1865: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or allowances shall be held as accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUSCLE SHOALS, BIRMINGHAM & PENSACOLA RAILROAD CO.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to take up out of the regular order No. 792 on the

calendar (S. 2722), a bill introduced by Congressman SMITHWICK, who is soon to leave this body, and I am sure every Member regrets that he is to leave and that they will extend him that courtesy.

Mr. BLANTON. And the only bill he has on the calendar.
Mr. HUDSPETH. The only one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to consider out of order Calendar No. 792 (S. 2722). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title to the bill, as follows:

A bill for the relief of the Muscle Shoals, Birmingham & Pensacola Railroad Co., the successor in interest of the receiver of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railroad Co.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$27,008.04 to the Muscle Shoals, Birmingham & Pensacola Railroad Co., the successor in interest of the receiver of the Gulf, Florida & Alabama Railway Co., as full compensation for amounts expended and unreclaimable in connection with the construction of an extension of tracks to the United States naval air station and yard at Pensacola, Fla.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. Those of us who know JOHN HARRIS SMITHWICK, of Florida, know him to be an able, efficient, wise, painstaking legislator. He is a kind, big-hearted, dependable friend. I am sure that every one of us who do know him intimately regret that he is to leave us. I think that his retirement is a distinct loss to the Government; it is a great loss to his people in Florida, and it is our loss here that he is not to be with us in the next Congress. Many of us will miss him greatly. I am sure that I speak the sentiments of all those present when I say that he carries with him our strong affection, confidence, and best wishes in whatever he does. [Applause.] I hope that sometime we shall see him back here. [Applause.]

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I just came in and heard the gentleman from Texas talking about the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITHWICK]. Mr. SMITHWICK has been in Congress for eight years. I have been here for 10 years, and therefore his senior in point of service. He bears the most remarkable record in that he has been the quietest man in the House and has passed every bill he has ever introduced, and that is a good many bills. Personally I regret exceedingly to see him retire to private life. I know that I speak not only for this House, but particularly for his own delegation, both in the House and in the Senate, when I say that we wish him good luck and Godspeed in whatever he undertakes. [Applause.]

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATILDA KLOPPING

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13119) for the relief of Matilda Klopping.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, their widows, and dependent relatives, Charles Klopping, who was a member of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment, New York Heavy Artillery, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 29th day of June, 1864: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

CALVIN H. BURKHEAD

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16080) for the relief of Calvin H. Burkhead.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to pay to Capt. Calvin H. Burkhead, out of any appropriation now or hereafter available for travel of the Army, the sum of \$1,971.60 to reimburse him for money paid by him while traveling under official orders in Alaska from July 1, 1922, to and including September 5, 1924.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTINE BRENZINGER

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1569) for the relief of Christine Brenzinger.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$526.50 to Christine Brenzinger, of Louisville, Ky., as compensation for injuries sustained on July 8, 1919, when struck by an automobile, at the time driven by a soldier of the United States Army.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 5, after the word "appropriated," add the following "and in full settlement against the Government."

In line 5 strike out the figures "\$526.50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCES L. DICKINSON

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11010) for the relief of Frances L. Dickinson.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Frances L. Dickinson the sum of \$60 as reimbursement of a payment made to a former postmaster at Essex, Conn., for 12 war-savings stamps which were never delivered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM A. LIGHT

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11459) for the relief of William A. Light.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized to examine into the claim of William A. Light, of Valentine, Ariz., in respect to the disability sustained by him on or about September 26, 1916, in the discharge of his official duties as superintendent of the United States Indian school agency at Mescalero, N. Mex., and to pay him compensation in accordance with the provisions of the employees' compensation act approved September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. L. pp. 742-750), as amended by the act of June 5, 1924.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of \$1,524.89, to William A. Light, of Valentine, Ariz., as compensation for injuries sustained on September 26, 1916, in the discharge of his official duties as superintendent of the United States Indian school agency at Mescalero, N. Mex."

The committee amendment was agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. LINDSAY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16182) for the relief of William H. Lindsay.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,811.25 to William H. Lindsay for services rendered between December, 1924, and September, 1926, at Glacier National Park, as expert mechanic and electrician, while holding the office of United States commissioner for the park.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle the claim of William H. Lindsay in the sum of \$2,811.25, for services rendered by him as a mechanic and electrician at Glacier National Park, Mont., during the fiscal years 1925, 1926, and 1927, out of the appropriation for said park for the fiscal year 1927, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes and of section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916 (39 Stat. L., p. 120)."

The committee amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

C. G. DUGANNE AND A. N. ROSS

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 17063) for the relief of C. G. Duganne and A. N. Ross.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office of the Treasury Department is hereby authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of C. G. Duganne, formerly disbursing clerk of the Federal Trade Commission, and A. N. Ross, present disbursing clerk of the Federal Trade Commission, both located at Washington, D. C., the amounts of \$42.80 and \$28.75, respectively, representing amounts paid by them and which were disallowed by the General Accounting Office as having been paid in contravention of the travel regulations of the Federal Trade Commission or the rulings of the General Accounting Office.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman a report from the Comptroller General on the bill just considered?

Mr. UNDERHILL. There is no written report from him, but the comptroller states that this is a technicality which requires action on the part of Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. And he is willing to have that done?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

E. A. GOLDENWEISER ET AL.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 5539) to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to settle and allow the claims of E. A. Goldenweiser, Edith M. Furbush, and Horatio M. Pollock for services rendered to the Department of Commerce.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what was the nature of these services?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, this is work that should only be done outside of the department, and the law, as I understand it, requires that it shall be done inside the department. There is no question, however, that the services were rendered, and the amount claimed is very reasonable. The Comptroller General found himself in a position where, according to the law, he was obliged to receive payment, but he has no objection to the payment of the amount.

Mr. SCHAFER. What is the amount?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Six hundred dollars in one case and \$2,000 in the other.

Mr. SCHAFER. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the Comptroller General stated to the gentleman that he is willing to have this done?

Mr. UNDERHILL. He made the statement to me that it was perfectly correct.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that his work on this Claims Committee is the best I ever saw. He is the best chairman of the Committee on Claims that I ever saw. He has killed more bad bills on that committee than have been killed in any term of Congress that I have been here, and I think his work deserves such great commendation that even though the Comptroller General had not agreed to this, I would not object to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and allow the claim of E. A. Goldenweiser in the sum of \$600, and the claim of Edith M. Furbush and Horatio M. Pollock in the sum of \$2,000 for services rendered the Department of Commerce in the preparation of monographs on census subjects notwithstanding provisions of existing law.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CAPT. JAMES P. WILLIAMS

The next business on the Private Calendar was the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 339) authorizing the Secretary of War to award a Nicaraguan campaign badge to Capt. James P. Williams in recognition of his services to the United States in the Nicaraguan campaign of 1912 and 1913.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to award a Nicaraguan campaign badge to Capt. James P. Williams, now a captain in the United States Army, Headquarters and Headquarters Troop, One hundred and fifty-sixth Cavalry Brigade, United States Army Reserve, for services rendered the United States Government in the Nicaraguan campaign of 1912 and 1913: *Provided,* That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued by virtue of the passage of this act.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

LEWIS H. FRANCKE AND BLANCHE F. SHELLEY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1564) for the relief of Lewis H. Francke and Blanche F. Shelley, sole legal heirs to Ralph K. Warrington.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum specified in section 2 of this act, to be paid to Lewis H. Francke and Blanche F. Shelley, of Kentucky, the sole legal heirs of the late Ralph K. Warrington, who died intestate on March 1, 1919.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of compensating the estate of Ralph K. Warrington, deceased, for the loss of personal property belonging to said deceased, through and by the theft and conversion at the hands of an employee of the Government of the United States, who under his duties was authorized as such employee to receive and take possession of said property, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$6,892.64. The said Ralph K. Warrington, at the time of his death, was a civilian employee in the Medical Department of the United States Army and assigned to duty on the ship *A. T. Sherman*.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full compensation against the Government, the sum of \$3,453.88 to Lewis H. Francke and Blanche F. Shelley, of Louisville, Ky., the

sole legal heirs of the late George A. Francke, who served as Ralph K. Warrington, formerly clerk, Medical Department at Large, United States Army, and who died intestate on March 1, 1919, for the loss of personal property belonging to the said deceased, through and by the theft and conversion at the hands of an employee of the Government of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ARTHUR E. COLGATE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 105) for the relief of Arthur E. Colgate, administrator of Clinton G. Colgate, deceased.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is an unusual bill, where we direct a court to find a judgment for \$50,000. It occurs to me that if we refer it to a court at all we ought to refer it for such judgment as the court deems just and proper.

Mr. VINCENT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this does not direct the court to find judgment for \$50,000, but it directs that it shall not find judgment for a greater sum than \$50,000. The reason this bill is referred again to the Court of Claims is this: That it was first referred by proper action to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act, and under that act they are not permitted to render a judgment but only to render a finding of fact and law and report the same back to the Congress. They accomplished that service for the Congress, and they reported that under the facts and the law they find that this person is entitled to a judgment for \$50,000; but since that time the question has been raised as to whether the document which transferred the right and title of the plaintiff in this case could legally transfer to him that part of the claim which accrued prior to the actual transfer of the title. Hence it was considered to be for the interest of the Government to send the case back to the Court of Claims, where that question of law can be determined and judgment rendered. The judgment could not carry a greater sum than \$50,000, and it may be less than that; and that is the purpose of the act.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the findings of fact made by the Court of Claims in the case of Arthur E. Colgate, administrator of the estate of Clinton G. Colgate, deceased, against the United States, Congressional, No. 6063, Senate Document No. 703, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, be, and they are hereby, referred back to the Court of Claims with jurisdiction to render such judgment as the findings of fact heretofore found and the law require: *Provided*, That either party hereto may appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States upon or from any conclusion of law or judgment, from which appeals now lie in other cases, at any time within 90 days after the rendition of judgment: *Provided further*, That the amount of any such judgment shall not exceed the sum of \$50,000: *And provided further*, That such notice hereof shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by orders of said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause one of his assistants to appear and defend for the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote, by which the bill was passed, was laid on the table.

J. C. HERBERT

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5787) for the relief of J. C. Herbert.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. C. Herbert, Hayesville, N. C., the sum of \$2,000 for services rendered the Government of the United States in connection with the location of and the establishment of title

of the United States to a certain tract of land containing 5,000 acres, situated in Clay County, N. C., and involved in a suit heretofore pending in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina, entitled "United States of America v. The Hiwassee Lumber Co.," said services having been rendered upon the request and advice of the then district attorney of the United States for said district.

Committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$750 in full settlement."

Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "the then" and insert in lieu thereof "two successive."

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "attorney" and insert the word "attorneys."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELLEN B. MONAHAN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13091) for the relief of Ellen B. Monahan.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the amendment, and I ask to be heard on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Ellen B. Monahan, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000, for physical injuries received by her as the result of being overcome by illuminating gas escaping from a pipe (said to have been broken through the negligence of an employee of the Treasury Department) on the 14th day of June, 1911, while she was in the employ of the Government of the United States and in the discharge of her duties as a clerk in the national bank redemption agency office of the Treasury of the United States.

Committee amendment:

In line 5, on page 1, after the word "appropriated," insert "in full settlement against the Government," and in line 6 strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$750."

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, this is presented as a committee amendment. No such amendment was made in the committee. The gentleman from Texas had the honor to report this bill to the whole committee and makes this statement in the presence of the entire committee present when this bill was presented. The gentleman from Texas does not know how it was incorrectly reported to the House, but the committee concluded this claimant was entitled to \$1,000, and the committee so decided and so ordered this case reported; and how this error has crept into the report the gentleman from Texas knows nothing about it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I will state for the benefit of the House, that was the understanding. The Chair does not know how the error occurred.

Mr. BLANTON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BOX. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. We have such a splendid clerk to that committee that sometimes when he believes the committee grants more than it should, out of the Public Treasury, he cuts it down and he may have done so in this case.

Mr. BOX. That committee runs its own affairs and does not permit the clerk to run them, when it knows it. Therefore, I think, this amendment should be voted down and that this claimant should be allowed the sum of \$1,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to inquire whether the gentleman's objection goes to the first amendment.

Mr. BOX. It only goes to the one changing the amount.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment, which the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated" insert the words "in full settlement against the Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 6, strike out "\$1,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$750."

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JOHN M. ANDREWS

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3464) for the relief of John M. Andrews.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the compensation laws and laws conferring rights and privileges upon honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, marines, and their widows and dependent relatives, John M. Andrews shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the United States Army as a private: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance of any kind accrue because of the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "from the United States Army as a private" and insert the words "as a private, Company F, Seventh United States Infantry, July 24, 1899; Troop I, Fourth United States Cavalry, August 24, 1906; Three hundred and forty-ninth Infantry, November 15, 1917."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "accrue" and insert the words "shall be held to have accrued."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BETHLEHEM SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12813) for the relief of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.). The objection which was raised before has been at least temporarily suspended.

Mr. BLANTON. Will not the gentleman just get recognition to speak out of order? The gentleman can move to strike out the last word or ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. COYLE. I will very gladly do that, as the gentleman from Texas was the one who objected to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is another one of our friends who is going to leave us, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order for five minutes.

Mr. COYLE. Three minutes will be sufficient.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this particular bill is one that I commend very seriously to your attention because, while the title calls for the relief of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, it ought perhaps to be written a bill to permit the Navy Department to pay its contract obligation which has been determined by law as its just debt to the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation. The bill authorizes the Comptroller General to settle this claim, which arises from the fact that the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation had a small subcontract during the war time with the West & Dodge Co., and the Navy Department notified them to discontinue payments under that contract. The West & Dodge Corporation, the subcontractor, subsequently sued the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation.

The Navy Department defended that suit and judgment was ordered against the contractor. The Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation and the Navy Department are now under agreement to save the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation harmless as a result of that suit. This amount has been paid by the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation now nearly one year ago.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If this is a just claim against the Navy, why has it not settled the claim?

Mr. COYLE. This claim has not been settled because the Navy Department has had neither the appropriation nor the legislative authority to settle it, going back into the year 1918 or 1919.

Mr. BLANTON. I have such a high regard for our friend, who is going to leave us, and he only having one bill on the calendar, that I shall withdraw my objection if he can get unanimous consent to go back to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to adjust and settle the claim of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.), on account of a judgment rendered in the case of the West & Dodge Co. v. The Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation (Ltd.) in the United States district court at Boston, Mass., which claim grew out of the contract of December 6, 1917, between the Secretary of the Navy and said corporation for the construction of torpedo-boat destroyers.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JOHN W. SIPLE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5179), to correct the military record of John W. Siple.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension and homestead laws governing the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, or any branch thereof, John W. Siple shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private of Company I, Seventy-seventh Regiment of Fourth Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, on February 27, 1863: *Provided*, That no pension shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "pension" insert the words "pay, or bounty."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM L. TROTT

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7146) for the relief of William L. Trott.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, William L. Trott, who was a member of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 25th day of June, 1865: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JAMES W. KINGON

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7211), for the relief of James W. Kingon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to James W. Kingon, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$170 in full settlement of all pay, bounty, and allowances due him for services in Company H, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JAMES P. DAVIS

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9927) to correct the military record of James P. Davis.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, James P. Davis, who was a member of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the 31st day of January, 1864: *Provided, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the initial "P."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

THEODORE HERBERT

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11433) for the relief of Theodore Herbert.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws, Theodore Herbert shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States in Company B, Ninety-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, on the 13th day of July, 1864: *Provided, That no pension shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.*

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "pension," insert the words "pay, or bounty."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER ASHBAUGH

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14161) to correct the military record of Alexander Ashbaugh.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to review the military record of Alexander Ashbaugh, late of Company D, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and grant him an honorable discharge.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Alexander Ashbaugh, who was a member of Company D, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 1st day of October, 1865: *Provided, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.*"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

CHARLES A. BLACK, ALIAS ANGUS BLACK

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14312) for the relief of Charles A. Black, alias Angus Black.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Charles A. Black, alias Angus Black, who was a member of Company B, Eleventh Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the 17th day of August, 1861: *Provided, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ALFRED ST. DENNIS

The next business on the private calendar was the bill (H. R. 15792) to correct the military record of Alfred St. Dennis.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Alfred Saint Dennis, who was a member of Company E, Fifty-seventh Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, Civil War, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the 6th day of May, 1864: *Provided, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.*

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Alfred St. Dennis."

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, page 1, strike out the words "Alfred Saint Dennis" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Alfred St. Dennis."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

MEDAL OF HONOR AND MERIT FROM THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 17088) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy to accept from the Republic of Haiti, the medal of honor and merit.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill (S. 3110) for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Commander Archibald L. Parsons and Lieut. Commander Ben Moreell of the Civil Engineer Corps of the United States Navy be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept from the Republic of Haiti the medal of honor and merit which has been tendered to each of said officers, through the Department of State, in appreciation of services rendered the said Republic of Haiti.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

DE WITT COUNTY NATIONAL BANK, OF CLINTON, ILL.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16224) for the relief of the DeWitt County National Bank, of Clinton, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem in favor of the DeWitt County National Bank, Clinton, Ill., United States registered note numbered J-105600 in the denomination of \$1,000 of the Victory Liberty Loan 4½ per cent convertible gold notes of 1922-1923, inscribed "Mrs. Alta F. Farnsworth," with interest from December 15, 1922, to May 20, 1923, without presentation of the note, said note having been stolen after being assigned in blank by the registered payee, now deceased, and the estate of the registered payee having been reimbursed for the note by the DeWitt County National Bank, Clinton, Ill.: *Provided*, That the said note shall not have been previously presented and paid: *And provided further*, That the said DeWitt County National Bank shall first file in the Treasury Department of the United States a bond in the penal sum of double the amount of the principal of the said note and the unpaid interest which had accrued thereon when the principal became due and payable in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury with condition to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the note hereinbefore described.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "paid," insert the words "and provided further."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "first," insert the words "reimburse the Postmaster General for any indemnity paid, and shall."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FINAS M. WILLIAMS

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10813) for the relief of Finas M. Williams.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, Finas M. Williams shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the service of the United States Army on August 14, 1913: *Provided*, That no back pay, pension, or allowances shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ALBERT J. ZYVOLSKI

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15519) for the relief of Albert J. Zyvolski.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$613.10 to Albert J. Zyvolski for loss of his personal property by fire in section house No. 21, Eklutna, on the Alaska Railroad on May 28, 1924.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

O. E. MOORE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16957) granting patent to O. E. Moore.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what kind of patent is this?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. It is a patent to a homestead. It is a homestead that has been involved in a number of withdrawals.

Mr. SCHAFER. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue a patent to O. E. Moore, conveying lot 11, in the southwest quarter of section 6, and lots 7, 8, 9, and 10, in the northwest quarter of section 7, township 47 north, range 2 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, as indicated on that certain plat of township 47 north, range 2 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, approved by the United States surveyor general's office, San Francisco, August 2, 1920, being the lands embraced in homestead entry of O. E. Moore, Sacramento serial 012117.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. GRAYSON

The next business on the private calendar was the bill (S. 1261) for the relief of William H. Grayson.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and the laws governing the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, or any branch thereof, William H. Grayson shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged on August 22, 1864, from the military service of the United States as a private of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry: *Provided*, That no pay, pension, bounty, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ROBERT P. COOKE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 17057) granting an annuity to Dr. Robert P. Cooke.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the rolls of the War Department the name of Dr. Robert P. Cooke and pay to him for and during his natural life, in lieu of all pensions, the sum of \$100 per month, in special recognition of the eminent service rendered, suffering endured, and permanent disabilities contracted by him in the interest of humanity and science as a volunteer subject for experiment in the yellow fever hospital in Cuba.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NEAR EAST RELIEF (INC.)

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 1752) for the relief of the Near East Relief (Inc.).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. VINCENT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how is this bill on the calendar?

Mr. UNDERHILL. That is what I want to find out.

Mr. VINCENT of Michigan. The committee never ordered it reported.

Mr. UNDERHILL. There is some doubt in the chairman's mind about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

There was no objection.

PERSONS SUFFERING LOSS IN LAWTON FIRE IN 1917

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 605 (H. R. 1579) a bill called up on a previous night and objected to by my colleague [Mr. BLACK of Texas]. The gentleman from Texas has finally consented to withdraw his objection and if no one else objects to let the bill be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 605 (H. R. 1579), for the relief of persons suffering loss on account of the Lawton fire, 1917. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$73,391.45 to the persons whose names appear below, as compensation in full for loss of property destroyed by the fire on September 24, 1917, in the city of Lawton, Okla., such loss having been the result of the inability of the fire department of the city of Lawton to control said fire because of lack of water, all available water for fire-fighting purposes having been appropriated and being used by the War Department in connection with the training of soldiers at Fort Sill and Camp Doniphan: Date Crabtree, \$1,132; H. D. Ingraham, \$33,682.57; Anna Beaver, \$1,800; W. Garven, \$1,000; Mrs. C. E. Bear, \$7,750; Joe Jacobson, \$3,000; Dr. L. C. Knee, \$3,000; S. J. Coffey, \$1,413.18; C. J. Aurell, \$406.75; J. G. Mitchell, \$3,077.88; John H. Ledgerwood, \$200; E. L. Shanklin and E. L. Kelley, \$1,550; Julia N. Burns, \$1,208; Hannah Beaver, \$700; Mary E. Wooten, \$3,150; Charles Fuson and J. E. Fuson, \$3,850; Ada Hammond and O. W. Northrup, \$2,419.72; Annabel Young, \$1,775.35; Lee N. Wallis, \$1,000; Mrs. E. C. Swisher, \$959; D. D. Dean, \$317.

With the following committee amendment:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$75,000 to the persons whose names appear below, as compensation in full for loss of property destroyed by the fire on September 24, 1917, in the city of Lawton, Okla., such loss having been the result of the inability of the fire department of the city of Lawton to control said fire because of lack of water, all available water for fire-fighting purposes having been appropriated and being used by the War Department in connection with the training of soldiers at Fort Sill and Camp Doniphan: Date Crabtree, \$1,132; H. D. Ingraham, \$33,682.57; Anna Beaver, \$1,800; W. Garven, \$1,000; Mrs. C. E. Bear, \$7,750; Joe Jacobson, \$3,000; Dr. L. C. Knee, \$3,000; S. J. Coffey, \$1,413.18; C. J. Aurell, \$406.75; J. G. Mitchell, \$3,077.88; John H. Ledgerwood, \$200; E. L. Shanklin and E. L. Kelley, \$1,550; Julia N. Burns, \$1,208; Hannah Beaver, \$700; Mary E. Wooten, \$3,150; Charles Fuson and J. E. Fuson, \$3,850; Ada Hammond and O. W. Northrup, \$2,419.72; Annabel Young, \$1,775.35; Lee N. Wallis, \$1,000; Mrs. E. C. Swisher, \$959; D. D. Dean, \$317; C. R. Simpson, \$2,850.15: *Provided*, That before any of said claims are allowed and paid the Comptroller General of the United States shall make an investigation of each of said claims to determine the extent and amount of such loss and damage, and such claims shall be adjusted in amounts not in excess of the amounts set out herein and upon certificates issued to each said claimant by the said Comptroller General of the United States.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

PAUL B. BELDING

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2197) for the relief of Paul B. Belding.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Paul B. Belding, of Hot Springs, Garland County, Ark., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 for injuries received while serving as a member of the Reserve Officers' Training Camp at Fort Sheridan, Ill., on the 24th day of June, 1921, due to the explosion of a rifle.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 6, after the word "appropriated," insert "and in full settlement against the Government."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM BARDEL

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3283) for the relief of William Bardel.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Bardel, the sum of \$4,800 for property loss sustained by him as a result of the war while acting as American consul at Rheims, France.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 5, after the word "appropriated," insert "in full settlement against the Government"; and after the word "to," in line 5, insert "the estate of."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

OLOF NELSON

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 17230) for the relief of Olof Nelson.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Will the gentleman withhold that objection?

Mr. BLANTON. How many people are there in this town?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yankton, on the Missouri River, is a city of 15,000.

Mr. BLANTON. This is a pretty big loss—\$20,000—and I want to say if the gentleman would investigate the losses, he would find hundreds of them that the Post Office itself approves when it does not believe in them. They are getting to be too frequent, and it is a disgrace.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. If the gentleman will let me state the facts: In the city of Yankton the Government maintains its own building—a fine building—and last summer robbers entered the post office in the early morning, blew open the safe, and got away with \$20,000 of Government money.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of Olof Nelson, postmaster at Yankton, S. Dak., with \$20,489.14 on account of loss sustained in the burglary of the post office on October 12, 1926.

Mr. BLANTON. Dynamited the safe?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes; and it was no fault of the postmaster.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw my objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SCHOONER "SENTINEL"

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7168) for the relief of the owner of the schooner *Sentinel*.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Treasurer of the United States is hereby authorized and instructed to pay to Capt. Louis P. Sunderland, owner of the schooner *Sentinel*, the sum of \$77.60 for cost of repair to said schooner *Sentinel*, which was damaged by collision with the United States Coast Guard cutter *Smith* on March 21, 1925.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out the first line and the first four words in line 4 and substitute as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEN WAGNER

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15305) for the relief of Ben Wagner.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof, as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government, the sum of \$150 to Ben Wagner, for the value of a horse at Broken Arrow, Okla., electrocuted by broken kite wire of the Weather Bureau which had come in contact with the high-power line of the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

POCAHONTAS FUEL CO.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16482) for the relief of the Pocahontas Fuel Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Pocahontas Fuel Co. (Inc.), a corporation duly organized by law and having a usual place of business in New York, N. Y., the sum of \$1,595.18, in full compensation for property damage done to the coal wharf owned by said corporation at New Bedford, Mass., by the United States Coast Guard cutter *Achusnet*, on April 20, 1926, as a result of negligence on the part of duly authorized agents of the Treasury Department, Coast Guard Service, in charge of the operation of the said *Achusnet*.

With the following amendments:

In line 8, strike out the figures "\$1,595.18" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,200." In line 11, substitute after "1926" a period in lieu of the comma, and strike out lines 12 to 14, inclusive.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES C. BASKIN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2279) for the relief of James C. Baskin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TOLLEY. I object.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. TOLLEY. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, we have passed several similar bills this evening, at least a half dozen. This bill was very carefully considered in the committee of the Senate and the committee of the House. This gentleman lives in my district. He is a splendid citizen, and the bill is drafted as suggested by the Secretary of War. We have passed a number of the same kind to-night, and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. TOLLEY. I have seen no bill that had a report of court-martial records in which a man was found guilty of repeated offenses. This man was an officer. There are enlisted men who have been deprived of their benefits who have not this officer's intelligence. Because of this man's influence he is now to have the benefit of this honorable discharge that an enlisted man similarly situated would not get.

Mr. FULMER. This case was not reviewed at all after the trial, and this party that was released by the gentleman was allowed to go home in charge of another officer. This party brought in some whisky, and it was not known at all by the gentleman who is now asking for relief. I know the man personally.

Mr. TOLLEY. I would not object to the gentleman's asking for unanimous consent to pass over the bill so that it will not be on the objected calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would say that the bill will retain its place on the calendar, even though objected to.

Mr. TOLLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object.

PURDY TRAGER

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1386) for the relief of Purdy Trager.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws Purdy Trager, now a resident of Newton, Iowa, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of Company L, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry: *Provided*, That no pension accrue because of this act prior to the passage thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 8, strike out the word "accrue" and insert "pay, or bounty shall be held to have accrued."

The committee amendment was agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JOHN P. PENCE

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13090) authorizing the President to reappoint John P. Pence, formerly an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army, an officer in the Signal Corps, United States Army.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WILLIAM EARHART

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14955) for the relief of William Earhart.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, William Earhart, who was a member of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry, Civil War, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the 18th day of August, 1863: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM MORIN

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15274) for the relief of William Morin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, William Morin, who was a member of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, Civil War, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the 25th day of January, 1864: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RICHARD B. BARNITZ

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 15357) authorizing the President to order Richard B. Barnitz before a retiring board for a hearing of his case and upon the findings of such board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ROBERT ZINK

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16658), to amend the military record of Robert Zink. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and the laws governing the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, or any branch thereof, Robert Zink, a resident of Illinois, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a musician of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, on the 18th day of July, 1865: *Provided*, That no pension, shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "shall accrue" and insert the words "pay, or bounty shall be held to have accrued."

The committee amendment was agreed to and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of Robert Zink."

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WILLIAM G. BEATY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16897) for the relief of William G. Beatty, deceased.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers and dependents, William G. Beatty, who was a member of Company C, First Battalion, Mississippi Mounted Rifles (subsequently Company I, Second Mississippi Volunteer Cavalry), shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the 20th day of May, 1864: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUTLER LUMBER CO. (INC.)

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 17108) giving jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the Butler Lumber Co. (Inc.).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear and determine the claim of the Butler Lumber Co. (Inc.), Richmond, Va., for damages resulting from the furnishing of piling in the erection of a fueling station on Craney Island, in Norfolk Harbor, Va., which station was erected under a contract dated May 21, 1921, between W. S. Rendle and the United States Shipping Board representing the United States of America.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPHINE THIBODEAUX

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5471) for the relief of Josephine Thibodeaux.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

JOHN STREVEY

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11231) to correct the military record of John Strevey.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers John Strevey shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private of Company F, Third Provisional Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, on the 28th day of October, 1865: *Provided*, That no pension shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "pension," strike out "shall accrue" and insert "bounty, back pay, or allowance shall be held to have accrued."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended.

PAUL B. BELDING

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 791.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BLANTON. For what purpose?

Mr. UNDERHILL. To ask for a reconsideration of the bill. My attention was distracted when the bill was reported.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman wants to put in a salutary amendment?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I want to reduce the amount.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to return to the bill (S. 2197) for further consideration. The Chair will state the only way anything can be done in relation to the bill now is by unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings.

Mr. LARSEN. Will not the gentleman wait until we have concluded this page?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I prefer to do it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that proceedings by which Calendar No. 791 was passed be vacated. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER. Reserving the right to object, is that the bill to make payment to an American consul?

Mr. UNDERHILL. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will again report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Paul B. Belding, of Hot Springs, Garland County, Ark., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 for injuries received while serving as a member of the Reserve Officers' Training Camp at Fort Sheridan, Ill., on the 24th day of June, 1921, due to the explosion of a rifle.

Committee amendment.

Page 6, after the word "appropriated," insert "in full settlement against the Government."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a further amendment to strike out the figures "\$5,000" and insert in place thereof the figures "\$1,500."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7, strike out the figures "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time and passed.

CHARLES ROBERTSON

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 16597) to correct the military record of Charles Robertson. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Charles Robertson, who was a private in Company C, Forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and in Company I, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of said Company C, Forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, on the 17th day of January, 1863: *Provided*, That no bounty, pension, pay, or allowances shall be held as accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

N. H. THIBODEAUX

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of H. R. 5471, for the relief of N. H. Thibodeaux. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] objected because there was no one here to explain it. The attention of the chairman of the committee was distracted at the time, but I think he can give an explanation.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have looked into it, and I find it is a good bill. Therefore, I will withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to return to the consideration of H. R. 5471. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500 to N. H. Thibodeaux, of Los Angeles, Calif., which sum was paid by him to the United States as a bail bond for appearance in court, said bail bond being declared forfeited by the court for nonappearance, but subsequently ordered paid back to him through an order of said court vacating the forfeiture of the bail bond, but which amount had been covered into the Treasury of the United States by the clerk of the court.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$2,000."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the initials "N. H." and insert "Josephine."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "by," strike out the word "him" and insert the word "her."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "court," insert the words "of N. H. Thibodeaux."

Page 1, line 11, after the word "to," strike out the word "him" and insert the words "said Josephine Thibodeaux."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

DENNIS W. SCOTT

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14664) for the relief of Dennis W. Scott.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Dennis W. Scott, who was a member of Company B, Thirty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a private of that organization on the 31st day of October, 1898: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CARLOS TOMPKINS

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 95) for the relief of Carlos Tompkins.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Carlos Tompkins, who served as a member of Troop H, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from said service on the 20th day of May, 1865: *Provided*, That no back pay, pension, bounty, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EUSTACIO B. DAVISON

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 1413) for the relief of Eustacio B. Davison.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and the laws governing the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, or any branch thereof, Eustacio B. Davison, formerly of Companies A and H, Eighty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a sergeant on the 13th day of June, 1862: *Provided*, That no pension shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PATRICK C. WILKES

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 1859) for the relief of Patrick C. Wilkes, alias Clebourn P. Wilkes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Patrick C. Wilkes, alias Clebourn P. Wilkes, private, Battery C, Second Regiment United States Artillery, which subsequently became the Fourteenth Company of Coast Artillery, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as of said organization on the 15th day of March, 1901: *Provided*, That no back pay, bounty, pension, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LILLIE F. EVANS

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I promised the gentleman from Georgia that at the completion of the calendar I would ask unanimous consent to return to the consideration of Senate bill 1818, for the relief of Lillie F. Evans. I now ask the gentleman to relieve me from that promise, due to the fact that it is so late we will not have time in which to properly debate the bill.

Mr. O'CONNELL of New York. Is the bill controversial?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes, very.

Mr. BLANTON. And we are going to have to be back here to-morrow.

Mr. UNDERHILL. So if the gentleman from Georgia will release me from my promise I will appreciate it.

Mr. LARSEN. I would like to know whether we are likely to have another opportunity to pass upon bills on the Private Calendar?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I think some day next week, between the consideration of conference reports, the Speaker of the

House will grant a little time for the consideration of some bills that have been placed upon the Private Calendar.

Mr. LARSEN. I am quite sure that the arguments on this bill would not consume over 10 minutes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I should want more time than that myself, and I am up against pretty strong opposition in the delegation from Georgia. I feel I would be derelict in my duty if I did not ask to be released from the promise I made to the gentleman.

Mr. LARSEN. I am really the only man on the Georgia delegation here, I believe.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UNDERHILL. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will release me from my promise; and, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 25, 1927, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Friday, February 25, 1927, as reported by the clerks of the several committees:

MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(10 a. m.)

Special subcommittee to consider Muscle Shoals.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the coordination of the public-health activities of the Government, and for other purposes (H. R. 10125).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1012. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting proposed draft of a joint resolution to regulate the operation of Government-owned radio stations for the use of the general public in the Virgin Islands, in American Samoa, and in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1013. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1927, in the amount of \$3,000 (H. Doc. No. 747); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (S. 4330) authorizing the Secretary of War to make settlement of the claim of the Franklin Ice-Cream Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 12754) granting a pension to Rebecca Dennis; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12666) granting an increase of pension to Mary Schoske; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LUCE: Committee on the Library. H. Con. Res. 56. A concurrent resolution for the appointment of a joint committee of the House and the Senate to join and participate in the celebration as representing the Congress of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the meeting of the Continental Congress at York, Pa., September 30, 1777, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. S. 4746. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 16998. A bill to amend section 224 of the Judicial Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 2236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Maryland: Committee on Military Affairs. H. J. Res. 370. A joint resolution increasing the membership of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and appointing certain members of the board; without amendment (Rept. No. 2237). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 16688. A bill to authorize the city of Muskogee, Okla., to remove and retain title to the boilers from the Municipal Hospital Building recently conveyed by the city to the United States Veterans' Bureau Hospital No. 90, at Muskogee, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2238). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2643. An act to provide for the cooperation of the United States in the erection in the city of Panama of a monument to Gen. Simon Bolivar; without amendment (Rept. No. 2239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 3403. An act to amend section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913; without amendment (Rept. No. 2240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 17268. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the meeting of the Continental Congress at York, Pa., September 30, 1777, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2245). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 17255. A bill for the relief of Joseph Jameson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOPER: Committee on War Claims. S. 4491. An act for the relief of G. W. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOPER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 13193. A bill for the relief of Maude A. Sanger; with amendment (Rept. No. 2242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 13279. A bill for the relief of the C. Tisdall Co., Herbert W. Smith, Newman Bros., Thomas J. Murphy Co., formerly Edward A. Brown Co., and Giles P. Dunn, jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 14067. A bill for the relief of William F. Goode; without amendment (Rept. No. 2244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 17320) granting the consent of Congress to O. F. Schulte, E. H. Otto, O. W. Arcularius, J. L. Calvin, and J. H. Dickbrader, their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 17321) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the department of conservation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 17322) to amend the act approved August 23, 1912, as amended by the act of February 28, 1916, providing for establishment of efficiency ratings and preference for persons honorably discharged from military or naval service employed in the civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 17323) an act to consolidate or acquire alienated lands in national parks by exchange; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HICKEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 369) providing for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, and establishing a commission to be known as the United States Pulaski sesquicentennial commission; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relating to the delivery to the States of all unappropriated public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WINTER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, to repeal the Federal estates (inheritance) tax provision of the revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relating to the delivery to the States of all unappropriated public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing Congress to amend and modify the so-called 640-acre homestead act of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VAILE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, urging the enactment of legislation for the retirement of disabled emergency officers of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ARENTZ: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing Congress to pass an act extending the benefits of the pension laws of the United States to all persons who served for any period of time in the military or naval service of the United States during any war and who were honorably discharged from such service; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 17324) for the relief of James Jorgenson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 17325) granting a pension to Dora L. Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 17326) granting a pension to Jennie E. Keown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 17327) granting a pension to David Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17328) for the relief of Atlantic Refining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Resolution (H. Res. 440) for compensation to continue the employment of three telephone operators from April 1 to November 30, 1927; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 441) to pay for additional clerical service in the enrolling room; to the Committee on Accounts.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 442) to provide an attendant to the retiring room of the female Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7376. Petition of Bibb Graves, Governor of the State of Alabama, advising of the creation of a commission, known as the Muscle Shoals commission, charged with the duty to investigate the right, title, and interest of the State of Alabama in and to the power dam, power site, and other improvements at Wilson Dam and Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7377. Petition of sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., asking the enactment of legislation providing for increase of pension to veterans of the Civil War and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7378. Petition of Washington Board of Trade, committee on public and private buildings, favoring a stadium for Washington; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

7379. By Mr. ANDREW: Petition signed by Mr. Noland E. Giles and other citizens of Beverly, Mass., favoring the passage of further legislation providing increases in pension for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7380. By Mr. BARKLEY: Petition of numerous citizens of Olive Hill, Ky., against House bill 7179; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7381. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Olive Hill, Ky., against House bill 7179; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7382. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Morehead, Ky., against House bill 7179; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7383. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Lexington, Ky., against House bill 7179; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7384. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the United States, requesting legislation which would remove existing barriers to extension of the present parcel post convention with Cuba; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7385. By Mr. BRIGHAM: Petition of Madora C. Brooks, of Bennington, Vt., favoring passage of legislation for the relief of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7386. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of citizens of Providence, R. I., opposing the Sunday observance law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7387. By Mr. CARSS: Resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of International Falls, Minn., urging support of the demand for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, completion of the improvements in the Mississippi, Missouri, and connecting waters, and other interior waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

7388. By Mr. CARTER of California: Petition of Eugene K. Sturgis and 25 other voters of Oakland, Calif., urging the passage of legislation increasing the pensions of veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7389. Also, petition of Mrs. Martha S. Chapman, of Modesto, Calif., and 73 other voters of Alameda County, Calif., urging the passage of legislation increasing the pensions of the veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7390. Also, petition of Mrs. Margaret M. Downing and eight other voters of Oakland, Calif., urging passage of legislation increasing the pensions of veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7391. By Mr. DAVIS: Brief and letter of American Legion, in support of the Tyson-Fitzgerald bills (S. 3027 and H. R. 4548) for the retirement of the disabled emergency Army officers; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7392. Also, resolution of the Immigration Restriction League, expressing opposition to the repeal of the national-origins quota basis provided in the present immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7393. By Mr. DYER: Petition of certain citizens of the city of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against passage of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7394. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of California State Legislature, indorsing House bill 16473, relating to the protection of the McCloud River; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7395. Also, petition of the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, favoring early passage of House bill 12444, the deportation bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7396. Also, petition of Santa Monica Bay Woman's Club, Santa Monica, Calif., through its corresponding secretary, Mrs. James Westervelt, urging that such emergency legislation to insure protection of Imperial Valley does not in any way hamper or impede any legislation pending for permanent flood control of districts irrigated by water from the Colorado River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

7397. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Memorial of Mr. Claude W. Soice, National Military Home, Dayton, Ohio, concerning conditions in home and requesting investigation of sanitary conditions in general mess and manner of handling food; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7398. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Gilman Bros. (Inc.), Boston, Mass., wholesale druggists, protesting against House bill 17130; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7399. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of citizens of Flint and Oxford, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 10311, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7400. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of 36 members of the Wallace Parent Teachers' Association, of Kelso, Wash., favoring the Curtis-Reed bill; to the Committee on Education.

7401. Also, petition of citizens of Hoquiam, Wash., in behalf of increased pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7402. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Grays Harbor County, Wash., protesting against passage of Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7403. Also, petition of citizens of the State of Washington, in behalf of increased pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7404. Also, petition of citizens of Napavine, Wash., in behalf of increased pensions for veterans of the Civil War and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7405. By Mr. KINDRED: Resolution of the Major James A. McKenna Post, No. 797, presented to the United States Congress, that the Adjutant General's office, Bureau of Navigation, and the Marine Corps, under the control of the United States Government, be allowed sufficient funds to provide the proper military escort for deceased veterans, and that it shall be mandatory for the commander of the nearest post, base, fort, or camp to furnish a proper and fitting escort for the deceased veteran, and that such request for military escort be made to the senior officer of the post, base, fort, or camp by the local veterans' organization nearest to the home of the deceased veteran, giving all data as to honorable discharge, residence, and place of burial, and that transportation of escort to and from the base, port, post, or camp to the place of burial be furnished by the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7406. Also, petition of 3,700 pharmacists of the New York State Pharmaceutical Association to the United States Congress, strongly protesting passage of Whisky Trust bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7407. By Mr. LANHAM: Petition of Prof. E. L. Drummond and others, protesting against the enactment of House bills 7179, 7822, 10123, and 10311; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7408. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of Dr. Edward E. White, Mrs. Bradbury, Joe Vicars, W. H. Jones, Mrs. Neony Wilson, and others, of Oilton, Okla., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring the Civil War pension bill to a vote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7409. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of 17 residents of Hart, Mich., in opposition to the enactment by Congress of the Sunday-closing legislation now pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7410. By Mr. McSWEENEY: Petition of the citizens of Doylestown, Ohio, asking for consideration of bill for further relief of Civil War veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7411. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of numerous citizens of Saline, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bills 7822, 10123, and 10311, known as the Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7412. Also, petition of several citizens of Medina, Lenawee County, Mich., asking that certain pension laws affecting Civil War soldiers and widows of soldiers be amended; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7413. Also, petition of several veterans of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars, of Tecumseh, Mich., asking that certain pension bills be passed by Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7414. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Ann Arbor, Mich., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 4821); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7415. Also, petition of several citizens of Ann Arbor, Mich., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 4821); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7416. By Mr. MONTAGUE: Petition of 179 residents of the third congressional district of Virginia, protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7417. By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: Petition signed by a number of voters in Logan County, Ky., urging immediate and favorable action on pension legislation pending in Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7418. By Mr. MURPHY: Petition by voters of Salem, Ohio, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7419. Also, petition by voters of Freeport, Ohio, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7420. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Irving E. Burdick, of New York City, favoring the passage of Senate bill 3641, known as the war minerals relief bill; to the Committee on Claims.

7421. By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: Petition of constituent citizens of the city of New Orleans, La., protesting against the enactment of any law enforcing the observance of any religious institution; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7422. By Mr. PEAVEY: Petition of J. J. Irwin and other citizens of Ashland, Wis., protesting against proposed legislation on compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7423. By Mr. PORTER: Petition for an acknowledgment of the authority of Christ and the law of God in the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7424. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of citizens of Belmont, Dunkirk, and Angelica, N. Y., in favor of Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7425. By Mr. ROBINSON of Iowa: Petition from the sewing-machine operators in the H. B. Glover factory in Dubuque, Dubuque County, Iowa, urging the enactment of the Walsh-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Labor.

7426. By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Petition of Samuel G. Coonrad and others, of Pike County, Ind., that the bill granting an increase of pension to Civil War widows be enacted into law at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7427. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of 192 residents of Epping and Williston, N. Dak., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7428. By Mr. SMITH: Petition signed by 55 citizens of Blackfoot, Idaho, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for an increase in the pensions of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7429. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of Iowa Retail Hardware Association, favoring negotiations with Canada, to the end that the terms and conditions of building and operating the St. Lawrence seaway shall be settled and the construction thereof begun; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

7430. By Mr. VAILE: Petition of the Fort Collins (Colo.) Chamber of Commerce, advocating the passage of pending legislation proposing an extension of the boundaries of Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

7431. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of Ithaca, Mich., protesting against enactment of legislation for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7432. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of citizens of Hornet, Jackson County, N. C., relative to increase in Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

7433. Also, petition of citizens of Old Fort, McDowell County, N. C., protesting against Sunday laws for District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7434. Also, petition of citizens of Asheville, N. C., protesting against Sunday laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7435. Also, petition of citizens of Candler, Buncombe County, N. C., protesting against Sunday laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

FRIDAY, February 25, 1927

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we are the recipients of Thy grace, and we would trust Thee in every emergency of life. Give us the understanding mind, the clearness of comprehension in reference to the great duties incumbent upon us. Lead us into the light always with the consciousness of Thy guidance, and so direct our paths that we may honor Thee. We ask in the name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MUSCLE SHOALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the bill S. 4106.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4106) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to execute a lease with the Muscle Shoals Fertilizer Co. and the Muscle Shoals Power Distributing Co., and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names: